

UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1939

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 22, 1939)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Arthur E. Paterson, of Middletown, Conn., chaplain of the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art the source of all that is good, at this, the beginning of another day, again we seek Thy blessing.

Bless the President of these United States, the Presiding Officer, and the Members of this House, and all those in this and other lands in places of public responsibility.

Especially in these days of peculiar stress in many lands, give us patience, wisdom, and a courageous faith; and increasingly move our people to know, love, and honor Thy law.

This we ask to the end that the children of our homes, and that generations to come in all the world, may praise Thee tomorrow because of what we are and do today. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 27, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5610) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 20, 21, 34, 50, 57, 58, 117, 129, and 133 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 15, 39, 41, 55, 75, 122, and 127 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 101 to the bill.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

LXXXIV—507

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	King	Reynolds
Andrews	Ellender	La Follette	Russell
Ashurst	Frazier	Lee	Schwellenbach
Austin	George	Lodge	Shipstead
Bailey	Gerry	Logan	Slattery
Bankhead	Gibson	Lucas	Smathers
Barkley	Gillette	McCarran	Stewart
Bilbo	Glass	McKellar	Taft
Bone	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Guffey	Mead	Tobey
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Townsend
Bulow	Hale	Minton	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Murray	Tydings
Byrd	Hatch	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hayden	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Herring	Nye	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Hill	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Overton	Wheeler
Connally	Holt	Pepper	White
Danaher	Hughes	Pittman	White
Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wiley
Donahey	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent because of his participation of the dedication exercises of the New Jersey Pavilion at the New York World's Fair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of California, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Senate Joint Resolution 28

Relative to Eel River flood control and channel rectification
Whereas frequent serious floods of the Eel River, in Humboldt County, constitute a serious menace to the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of this State, in that they cause soil erosion, debris obstruction, frequent river-bed shallowing and changing, constant increase in the course, winding and spreading of the river, gradual washing away of thousands of acres in Eel River Valley and the destruction and damage to farm structures, livestock, and crops in the Eel River delta; and

Whereas as a result of the foregoing, destruction occurs which runs into millions of dollars; and

Whereas the control of the waters of the Eel River by revetment, channel straightening, rectification and deepening, and debris removal would assist in the prevention of such destruction and aid in the reclaiming of thousands of acres of Eel River delta lands, the controlling of the floodwaters of the Eel River, and in reducing the height of floodwaters, so as to, within a few years, effect sufficient property saving to repay the cost of such work; and

Whereas United States engineers in the twelfth district will within a short time complete a survey of the Eel River directed to be made in connection with a congressionally approved Federal project in relation to the Eel River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the President and Congress of the United States be memorialized to include revetment, channel straightening, deepening, and rectification within said Eel River project and to appropriate Federal moneys in sums sufficient to complete said works at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from California be hereby respectfully requested to urge such action; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and to each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Local No. 432, Farmers Union, of Chester, Mont., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 2395) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in wheat, providing for the orderly marketing of wheat at fair prices in interstate and foreign commerce, insuring to wheat producers a parity income from wheat based upon parity price or cost of production, whichever is the higher, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Robert Boeracher, of Findlay, Ohio, praying that the United States keep clear of foreign entanglements, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Angelo Perillo, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the so-called Murray-Casey bill, being the bill (S. 2507) to provide a program for the relief of unemployment by affording opportunities for employment upon a public-works program to persons unable to secure private employment, which was referred to the Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of several citizens of San Francisco, Calif., praying that the Federal theater, arts, and music projects be retained in pending legislation making appropriations for work relief, relief, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for amendment of the pending joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, so as to exempt handicapped persons who have been employed by the W. P. A. for 18 months from being laid off for a period of 60 days, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the enactment in its present form of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and favoring the enactment of such a relief measure as proposed by the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of several citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying that a provision to the effect that workers under the W. P. A. for 18 months or more shall be laid off for a period of 60 days be retained in pending relief legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PEPPER presented the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

House Memorial 14

Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the continuation of the present system of operating camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the State of Florida

Whereas it has been reported that Federal authorities, who are in charge of determining the policy followed in the operation of camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the State of Florida, are contemplating a change in the method of operating said camps, such proposed change to substitute civilians for Reserve officers of the United States Army, as the persons in charge of said camps; and

Whereas it would appear that the type of training and discipline afforded by the present system, which places such camps under the direction of Reserve officers of the United States Army, is beneficial to the persons enrolled in such camps and is advantageous to the welfare of the people of the United States from a military viewpoint: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully petitioned and requested to enact laws preserving the present system of operating camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps, under the direction of Reserve officers of the United States Army; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the two United States Senators and the five Members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Florida.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 687) thereon.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 324) for the relief of S. A. Rourke, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 688) thereon.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 119) for the relief of Helen M. Crowley, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 689) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2491) for the relief of Edward J. Gebhart, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 690) thereon.

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1953) for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Barnard, Charles A. Stephens, Donald W. Prairie, and Mrs. Vern A. Needles, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 691) thereon.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1289) for the relief of the city of Leavenworth, Kans., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 692) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2083. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Parker McKee, Sr., and Louise McKee (Rept. No. 693); and

H. R. 3541. A bill for the relief of John Chastain and Mollie Chastain, his wife (Rept. No. 694).

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6205) to provide for additional clerk hire in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 695) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6791) making additional appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 696) thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 2663) to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of

clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 697) thereon.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 153) authorizing the printing of the Executive Journals of the Senate (submitted by Mr. PITTMAN on the 27th instant), reported it without amendment.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 22, 1939, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1117) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men or former enlisted men of the United States Navy for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane at the submarine base, New London, Conn., on September 21, 1938.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 2712. A bill to amend section 2803 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2713. A bill requiring reductions in Government expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2714. A bill to amend title III, veterans' provisions, section 27, of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, by adding to section 27; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2715. A bill granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Shelton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. 2716. A bill to create a National Tax Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GIBSON:

S. 2717. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Broggi; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2718. A bill granting an increase in pension to Fannie J. Savery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2719. A bill to provide additional civil remedies against violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

S. 2720. A bill authorizing Douglas County, Nebr., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Florence Station, in the city of Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present to Nicholas Casale an appropriate certificate in recognition of his military service during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. MALONEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 162, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS (for Mr. LUNDEEN) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the relief of victims of the tornado which occurred in Hennepin and Anoka Counties, Minn., on June 18, 1939, intended to be proposed by Mr. LUNDEEN to the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THIRD TERM FOR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to place some newspaper items in the RECORD, but before making the request I shall make a short statement.

On Monday of this week I received a telegram from Mr. Walter Harrison, editor of the Daily Oklahoman. The telegram contained the question, "Are you for Roosevelt for a third term?" I wired back in four words, "As strong as horseradish."

This morning I noticed the following headline in the Washington Post:

Senator LEE climbs on third-term band wagon.

They would be closer to the truth if they said I helped to make it. I am surprised to have that appear in this newspaper, giving the impression that I am just now advocating a third term, when in the same newspaper—the Washington Post—of Friday, May 12, 1939, appeared an article under the headline "Democratic Women hear Senator LEE," in which it is stated:

Senator LEE launched his speech with the third term as the keynote and followed it through, diverging only long enough to discuss the three measures for which he urged support.

On March 1 of this year I addressed the Cosmos Luncheon Club here in Washington, D. C., advocating a continuation of the Roosevelt policies and a third term, if necessary, to carry them out. Then at Lancaster, Pa., at a Jefferson Day dinner on April 13, of this year, I made a speech in which I advocated a continuation of the liberal program of Roosevelt and a third term, if necessary, in order to accomplish that. The news services likewise carried the statement in which I was committed to a third term.

In fact, Mr. President, publicly and privately for over a year I have been giving expression to similar declarations, and I do not like to be pictured as climbing on a third-term band wagon which I have been helping to make from the very beginning.

I ask that the two articles to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 28, 1939]

SENATOR LEE CLIMBS ON THIRD TERM BAND WAGON

Senator LEE (Democrat), of Oklahoma, joined his colleague, Senator ELMER THOMAS, yesterday in support of a third term for President Roosevelt. LEE said he was "strong as horseradish" for the idea.

[From the Washington Post of May 12, 1939]

DEMOCRATIC WOMEN HEAR SENATOR LEE—THIRD TERM, FARM RELIEF, JOBS, AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS ARE HELD MAJOR OBJECTIVES

(By Jessie Ash Arndt)

A third term for President Roosevelt and championship of farm relief, old-age pensions, and jobs for the unemployed were advanced by Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma, last night as objectives for the Democratic Party in 1940. Addressing the Woman's National Democratic Club, he declared that, in the Democratic National Convention, "Roosevelt will either carry the ball or call the signals."

"The play will hit the left side of the line, just left of center," Senator LEE added. "There may be some on our team who will try to make the play go to the right, but I am sorry to say that I fear they will be knocked down and run over. * * * The best answer to radicalism is liberalism. Franklin D. Roosevelt is today saving the country from a dangerous left turn."

"If the opposition were able to destroy Roosevelt's leadership today, this country would not swing back to the right, but it would go further to the left."

Senator LEE launched his speech with the third term as the keynote and followed it through, diverging only long enough to discuss the three measures for which he urged support.

"In my opinion, there is but one argument that might cause President Roosevelt to consider a third term," he said, "which is that his work is not finished."

SEES BUT ONE ARGUMENT AGAINST

Declaring that the only argument against third term was that it had never been done, Senator LEE cited the fact that a similar argument would have kept Columbus from discovering America and Lindbergh from flying the Atlantic. George Washington's retirement after a second term he assigned to Washington's advancing years.

He met the argument that the President might become a dictator by saying that he had not abused his power during his two terms, which gave assurance that he would not do so. The country would take a chance on a new man's doing so, he said.

"Last week," said Senator LEE, "the national Republican Party, under the guise of the national chamber of commerce, held its annual session here in Washington and the spokesmen of that organization did their best to make it appear that everything is against the policies of this administration."

He said of the November elections, that they brought into office Republicans who "in their campaign pledges were more liberal than the Democrats they replaced."

BIG TAX PROGRAM HELD ESSENTIAL

Hand in hand with championship of the measures he advocated, Senator LEE declared "our party must have courage to champion a tax program that will make it possible to carry out these three important measures. . . . The program will yield enough increased national income to reward our efforts. By such a program, the Government can take money from the mountain tops of wealth in this country and level up the valleys of despair."

SERMON BY DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon delivered by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick on February 19, 1939, at Riverside Church, New York City, the text being Dare We Break the Vicious Circle of Fighting Evil With Evil, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH PHILIPPINES—STATEMENT BY SAMUEL F. GACHES

[Mr. GIBSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Samuel F. Gaches, relative to the economic relations between the Philippines and the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION ON NEUTRALITY BY AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a declaration by a group of American citizens of Akron, Ohio, regarding neutrality, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT HELD RIGHT AND BIG BUSINESS WRONG ON ECONOMY APPRAISAL—ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jay Franklin, published in the Washington Evening Star of May 31, 1939, entitled "Roosevelt Held Right and Big Business Wrong on Economy Appraisal," which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK-RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 21, beginning in line 14, as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I understood the situation last night, the committee amendment on page 21 was allowed to go over on the understanding that it was to be reworded. I inquire if any effort has been made to reword that section?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that there was talk about it but no agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that the amendment be passed over temporarily in order to try to work out some language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to passing over the amendment temporarily? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, we then are in such a position, I take it, that I may ask the Senator from Colorado to explain to us line 10, on page 22. In that connection I ask the Senator to observe that certification of work-relief clients may be made by "a local public certifying agency" or "the Work Projects Administration where no such agency exists"; and then we come to the nub of the import of this matter—

Or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies.

Will the Senator, for our benefit, please explain what possibilities are open to the Work Projects Administration by virtue of the last alternative?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this is a provision which came from the House. I do not know that I can offer any suggestions other than such as are open to the Senator from Connecticut.

It is no answer to say to the Senator that the committee has been driven to act under great pressure as to time. We have not given the time that we would have liked to give to the different sections. It is not our fault. The House, exercising its own prerogative, considered the joint resolution, and it only came into our hands about 6 or 8 days before final enactment was imperative.

The purpose of this provision, as I gather, is to provide that the first agency charged with responsibility of certification shall be the local agency, which is the case now in all but a few States, or, in the absence of a local certifying agency, the W. P. A. I may say to the Senator that there are four States in which the W. P. A. have found the local certifying agencies to be either neglecting or not properly performing their functions, and they have taken over all the burdens of certification. I do not want to put in the RECORD the names of the States, but there were four States in which the Works Progress Administration, for the purpose of efficiency, felt compelled, according to their statement, to take over the burdens of certification.

If the matter were left to me, I would have all certifications made by the W. P. A. As the money is being provided by the Federal Government, I would have the Federal Government do the certifying; but that is not the wish of the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I point out, then, that as the matter now stands, and as the language appears here, first, persons may be removed from the rolls; second, nobody may get on the rolls unless first a local certifying agency shall certify, or, in the alternative, the W. P. A. shall certify; and in the last connection it obviously has the right, has it not, to reject local certifications?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; which it has always exercised. Local certification has never been final or binding. It has always been a preliminary certification. In many places where the W. P. A. felt that the certifying officers were very careful, the local certifications have been accepted, not as a matter of law but as a matter of administration. Elsewhere the W. P. A. have reinvestigated.

We know that in the past year the W. P. A. was perhaps unduly lenient, because when the Congress directed the W. P. A. to make an investigation and eliminate those who did not belong on the rolls, some 60,000 persons were taken off who had gotten through the various certification agencies and on the rolls, but were not entitled to be there; also, an additional number of aliens who had been kept on the rolls in violation of law. But we are dealing with more than 3,000,000 persons, and it is inevitable that there shall be some errors. We thought the errors were perhaps larger than they should be.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the press reports that the administrative heads of the W. P. A. in a certain State have recently been transferred to another State because of their interjection of politics into their administration. If ever there was a clause that makes it possible for such politically minded persons to reject local certifications, and thereafter, by refusing to accept the local certifications, to put on persons of their own choice, it is this clause. Is not that so?

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator had the list of States in which local certification has been refused, I think he would see that it was not a political action on the part of W. P. A.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, at this time I desire to make a very brief statement about a situation which concerns another bill, but about which I have heretofore made some comments on the floor.

Sensors may recall that I stated on the floor the other day that if it became necessary I should offer as an amendment to the now pending relief bill the substance of what has come to be known as section 9 of Senate bill 1871. I made the statement, I think repeatedly, that such action would be taken if necessary. In doing so, I impute no bad

faith against anyone, against any committee of either body of the Congress; but it seemed that Senate bill 1871, having passed the Senate in April, should receive attention in the other branch of the Congress.

Generally, I do not believe in the practice of legislation on an appropriation bill. I dislike and did not want to take that course unless it should be necessary. Since that time—in fact, on yesterday—I conferred with Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, which is considering Senate bill 1871. Specifically, I conferred with the acting chairman of that committee, Mr. CELLER, and with the Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. They spoke not only for themselves but also for Representative HEALEY, of Massachusetts, chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill. They informed me that on Tuesday of this week the House committee had considered the first five sections of Senate bill 1871, and had passed on those sections of the bill practically without change, except that section 5, in my opinion, was considerably strengthened by the House action. The understanding was that the House committee will act on Senate bill 1871 on Thursday of this week, and report it to the House of Representatives.

In addition to that, the gentlemen whom I have mentioned assure me that they personally will appear before the Rules Committee of the House and request a rule to obtain a vote on this Senate bill. The Representative from my State [Mr. DEMPSEY], a member of the Rules Committee, was also present, and gave me as definite assurance as a man can give under the circumstances that the Rules Committee would provide for a rule to have a vote in the House of Representatives. In addition to that, Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, authorized me to say that the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives would also request the Rules Committee to grant the rule.

I make this statement deliberately for the RECORD at this time in order that there may be a clear understanding in the Senate and in the House. If I have misunderstood the agreement in any way, I shall be glad to be corrected. I am sure I did not misunderstand it, and that it is just exactly as I have stated it.

In view of the situation that pends on the present relief measure, the fact that time is limited, and perhaps it would not be fair to the Senate or the conferees of the Senate to insist on a controversial matter such as section 9 may be, and further and expressly in view of the representations made to me as I have outlined by the Members of the House of Representatives, I shall not now offer that amendment to the pending joint resolution.

But I wish to state, Mr. President, that I know these understandings are not ironclad; occasionally they go astray; and if, for any reason, the understanding to which I have referred should not be carried out, and if the House of Representatives should not have an opportunity within a reasonable time to vote on Senate bill 1871, I think I would be perfectly justified in asking the Senate to suspend the rule and permit me to offer the amendment to any measure which may be coming over to the Senate and which will require a vote by the House of Representatives, and that is exactly what I propose to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 22, to strike out lines 14 to 19, inclusive, as follows:

(e) After April 1, 1940, no person eligible to receive benefits provided for by the Social Security Act shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this title for any period for which there are available sufficient funds to enable the payment of such benefits to him.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 20, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 3, before the word "The", to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)", and in the same line, before the word "shall", to strike out "Board" and insert "Commissioner", so as to read:

(f) The Commissioner shall cause a periodic investigation to be made of the rolls of relief employees on work projects, and shall eliminate from the rolls those not in actual need, such investigation to be made so that each case is investigated not less frequently than once every 6 months.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "own", to insert a comma and "and if he has first drawn all the benefits of unemployment compensation that shall have accrued to him during his term in private employment", so as to read:

(b) Any person who takes such private employment shall at the expiration thereof be entitled to immediate resumption of his previous employment status with the Work Projects Administration if he is still in need and if he has lost the private employment through no fault of his own, and if he has first drawn all the benefits of unemployment compensation that shall have accrued to him during his term in private employment.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether or not he would be willing to accept an amendment to this amendment by adding at the conclusion thereof the words "and which are available to him"? My reason for suggesting the amendment is that, as the committee amendment stands, the mere fact that an individual might have unemployment compensation money accruing to him would make him ineligible for assistance under the act. We know that there are many instances, and as time goes on I think there will be more, of persons being entitled to this money but, because of difficulties of accounting, and so forth, they are not able to get it. All I propose is that a man must actually have the money available as well as accrued.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, Mr. President, I have no right to accept the amendment; but I will say that, so far as I am individually concerned, and as a member of the committee, I will accept the amendment. I think its purpose is sound.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I move, then, that the amendment of the committee beginning in line 21, page 23, be amended by inserting before the period at the end of the proposed amendment, after the word "employment", the words "and which are available to him."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 19, before the word "No", to insert "(a)"; in line 20, before the word "employment", to strike out "for" and insert "in"; and in line 22, after the word "this", to strike out "title" and insert "joint resolution", so as to read:

SEC. 18 (a) No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless such person before engaging in such employment (or prior to August 1, 1939, in the case of any person employed before such date who has not taken an oath of office) subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

The head of the agency shall designate administrative and supervisory employees to administer such oath, but no fee shall be charged therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 14, before the word "No", to insert "(b)"; in line 15, before the word "resolution", to insert "joint", and in the same line, after the word "pay", to strike out "the salary of" and insert "any compensation to", so as to read:

(b) No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 19, after the word "expenses", to strike out "(not to exceed \$500 for any one agency) of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized" and insert "of attendance at meetings of officials and employees of the agency on official business", so as to read:

SEC. 21. The appropriations in this joint resolution for administrative expenses and such portions of other appropriations in this joint resolution as are available for administrative expenses may be obligated in the amounts which the agency, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary for personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for contract stenographic reporting services, supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals, newspapers and press clippings; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of officials and employees of the agency on official business; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this joint resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, an amendment on page 25 has already been agreed to, but my attention has just been attracted to it, and I desire to propound a question to the Senator having the joint resolution in charge, because the amendment concerns me somewhat, not its purpose, for I am in thorough accord with the purpose of the amendment, but how will it be construed by the General Accounting Office? Will the salary of everyone be held up until it is determined whether he has been advocating the overthrow of the Government? It struck me, on reading the amendment yesterday, that that might present some complications in administration. Has the Senator from Colorado any ideas on that subject?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have assumed that the burden would be the other way around, that those who are on the relief rolls and who draw salaries would be presumed to be loyal citizens, and that the obligation of denying compensation by reason of their advocacy of overthrow of the Government would rest upon the employing agencies.

Mr. HATCH. That interpretation would suit me very well. If I thought the General Accounting Office would adopt the interpretation, there would be no confusion and no harmful results from it. I wonder whether the committee report interprets the language.

Mr. ADAMS. It does not.

Mr. HATCH. I do not know how to get at what I have in mind, but I suggest for the RECORD that the officials of the General Accounting Office read the remarks of the Senator having the joint resolution in charge, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], and adopt the interpretation which the Senator from Colorado has placed on this section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 22, after the word "tenure", to insert a comma and "and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed", so as to read:

SEC. 22. (a) The provisions of Executive Order No. 7916, dated June 24, 1938, shall not apply to positions the compensation of which is payable from appropriations contained in this joint resolution, and such appropriations shall not be available for the compensation of the incumbent of any position placed in the competitive classified civil service of the United States after January 10, 1939.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the agencies receiving appropriations herein or allocations under such appropriations are authorized to accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, appoint, without regard to civil-service laws, such officers and employees, and utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, such Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State such State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the head of the agency involved, as may be necessary, and prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure, and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 28, to strike out:

(c) Under the appropriations in this title, no increase in compensation shall be granted to any administrative officer or employee, but this prohibition shall not be applicable in case of a change in office or position which increases the responsibilities or duties, or both, of any such officer or employee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado the reason for striking out lines 1 to 6, which include salary increases.

Mr. ADAMS. The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] in the committee, as I recollect, explained that in the Reorganization Act there were provisions which covered this situation, and that this would conflict. I am not clear in my own mind, but the Senator from South Carolina is the expert on reorganization, so I ask him to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in the Reorganization Act there is a provision to the effect that employees transferred to any other department by reason of any order of the President shall not be transferred to a higher grade. The exact language I cannot recite, but the object was to prevent something which has quite often occurred when there was a merger. When an employee was transferred to a new department he would often be transferred to a higher grade. There was a proviso that nothing contained in the act should be construed to prevent promotions after the end of the fiscal year.

A number of the departments have called my attention to the fact that because the Reorganization Act went into effect on July 1 it froze in the positions they held a number of persons who they think would be entitled to promotions, and it has been said they would be frozen for a whole year.

Of course, I do not cry about that. I think that if for 12 months there were no increases in salaries the world would not come to an end. However, I believe that in such matters we should try to do that which is just and fair to all employees. Therefore I suggested that this language be stricken out, because it would give to W. P. A. employees what was denied to the employees of all other organizations transferred. After the first of the year, immediately afterward, I intend, because of the interest I have taken in the Reorganization Act, to make an investigation to determine whether or not this does work a hardship; and if the Congress has to act on it, I think it should act as to all agencies and not only as to the W. P. A. It may be we will determine that the language should be modified in some way. I am disposed to think so.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator feels, then, that striking out the language in question really will prevent increases in salaries?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. The provision as it stands would give to the W. P. A. employees immediately after July 1, though they are transferred to the public-works agency, the right to an increase in salary, whereas other employees transferred to the same division would be denied that right. I think all should be treated alike. I think it may be wise to modify the language, but I think that ought to be done after we make an investigation, and it should apply not only to one agency.

Mr. HOLT. The reason I asked the question is that I have made a study of W. P. A. salary increases in the State of West Virginia. It was said that there were 538 administrative employees on W. P. A. in that State. I investigated the salaries paid when they first began to work in W. P. A. and the reason for the increases, and I found that 210 of those individuals had received salary increases varying from \$60 to \$120 a year.

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that one thing that causes me to believe that it is wise to follow the course I have suggested is that I am advised that, because of the provisions in the W. P. A. Act, some employees in the Department anticipate that after July 1 increases in salary could be made, and that prior to July 1 they would be as busy as a one-arm paperhanger.

Mr. HOLT. The sickening thing to me is to see applicants for relief told that they cannot get jobs because there is no money with which to pay them. They are told, "We cannot

put you on W. P. A. today because we are out of funds." Then we can look back and see the salary increases which have been given. That process is going on continually. One man in my State was receiving \$3,200 per year, which was more than he ever before received in his life, but his salary was increased to \$6,000.

I shall not make a long statement, but simply for the information of the Senate I wish to say that I found in the State of West Virginia—and again I say it is a small State—107 individuals who received salary increases of from \$60 to \$240 a year, 70 who received salary increases of from \$300 to \$600 a year, 20 who received salary increases of from \$660 to \$960 a year, and 11 who received salary increases of over a thousand dollars a year. Of the 538 administrative employees the W. P. A. claim they have, I found 210 salary increases. At the same time it is said that there is no money at all to be used for relief.

Mr. President, at this point I ask that the list to which I have referred may be included in the RECORD. It shows the number of persons whose salaries were increased in the State of West Virginia and the amount of the increases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

One at \$2,800; 1 at \$1,960; 1 at \$1,500; 1 at \$1,440; 2 at \$1,200; 1 at \$1,100; 1 at \$1,080; 1 at \$1,020; 1 at \$1,000; 6 at \$900; 1 at \$840; 1 at \$800; 2 at \$780; 1 at \$720; 2 at \$700; 7 at \$660; 12 at \$600; 4 at \$540; 6 at \$480; 6 at \$420; 1 at \$400; 11 at \$360; 20 at \$300; 45 at \$240; 2 at \$200; 22 at \$180; 19 at \$120; 2 at \$100; 17 at \$60.

Mr. HOLT. Let me be specific with respect to just five salary increases. I wish to show the Senate that at the same time W. P. A. is telling the relief worker that there is no money for him they are increasing the salaries of some of their personnel. One man on a project received \$85 a month. They boosted his salary to \$210 a month, or an increase of \$1,500 a year. Another man in the same county who was getting \$75 a month had his salary boosted to \$200 a month, or \$1,500 increase per year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator identify the time when these things happened?

Mr. HOLT. Between 1936 and 1938; in 2 years' time. Another man in the same county who was paid \$75 a month received an increase in salary to \$200 a month, or \$1,500 a year, which is three times more than the project worker would receive if he worked every week in the year in West Virginia.

I find that one man who was getting \$85 a month had his salary increased to \$225 a month, or an increase of \$1,680 a year.

Another man's salary was increased from \$95 to \$225 a month, or \$1,560 a year.

All this occurred in one county in my State.

I found over 25 salary increases there, but every one of the 5 increases in that 1 county to which I have specifically referred amounted to more than \$1,500 a year. That represents not total salary but simply the increase. At the same time people are told that there is no money for relief.

In the State and district offices I myself found that salary increases totaled \$78,000. My opinion is that the total salary increases in the State of West Virginia will amount to more than \$100,000 a year. Yet it is said there is no money with which to employ needy persons.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that we should not raise salaries in the W. P. A. so long as people are applying for relief. If we have money that can be used to raise salaries, why not take that money and use it to put needy persons to work?

I am glad the amendment was accepted. However, I did wish to call the attention of the Senate to the large salary increases. In my opinion they will amount to millions of dollars throughout the United States.

Mr. President, one reason those in charge get away with it is because they keep the pay roll secret, and feel that people will not find out what has occurred. If we have sufficient

money to enable such salaries to be increased, then we have money with which to employ needy people.

Yesterday the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] spoke of "career men." It is not a question of those who are employed on W. P. A. being "career men." It is the bosses who are career men.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, is the information the Senator has just referred to generally available in any form?

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, it is not available, because the W. P. A. officials specifically say it is not. I have before me a letter written last fall by Mr. Aubrey Williams, who at that time was acting for Mr. Harry Hopkins. I wrote to him and asked him for a statement of the pay rolls in West Virginia. He replied:

DEAR SENATOR HOLT: I have your letter of the 19th, requesting a list of the persons on the W. P. A. administrative pay roll in West Virginia. If there is any particular information that you want about any particular person I shall be glad to furnish you with it, but I am not approving the sending of the whole personnel list to you.

In other words, a Member of the Senate cannot find out who is on the administrative pay roll in his own State, according to Mr. Williams. The letter from which I read is dated October 20.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does that represent general practice, or is that merely a personal compliment to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HOLT. I think it is a general practice, because I notice that a letter was placed in the RECORD in the other House recently, in which the administrative pay-roll list requested was denied a Member of the House.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How did the Senator get his information finally?

Mr. HOLT. I received my information through the General Accounting Office, and not through the W. P. A. The W. P. A. has never given me the pay-roll list of the W. P. A. in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator think the information would be available through the General Accounting Office to any Senator who might apply for it?

Mr. HOLT. I am not sure about that. It takes a great amount of work to obtain the information. I had to delegate some individuals in my office to help the General Accounting Office go through the list of the personnel. I cannot say whether or not the information would be available in the way the Senator mentioned. I know it should be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of no reason on earth why this particular information should not be available to Members of the Senate. As a matter of fact the furnishing of such information should be required.

Mr. HOLT. I intend to offer an amendment to the joint resolution later today which will provide that the Administrator shall be required to submit to the Congress a list of the nonsecurity employees who make more than \$1,000 per year, which will allow every Congressman to find out who are on the pay rolls and how much they get, because certainly it is the duty of Congress to know who are on the pay rolls. I hope there will be no objection to such an amendment, for we make all other agencies furnish a list of those on their pay rolls. Why should the W. P. A. keep secret its pay roll?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think if that information were made public in every State, it would have a tremendous impression on the people, and would result in the reduction of overhead expense in connection with relief.

Mr. HOLT. I can assure the Senator that since I made public in West Virginia the information I mentioned there has been a tremendous reduction in the administrative pay roll.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Has it not occurred to the Senator that if information is not available to him when he makes request for it, it can be obtained through the adoption of a Senate resolution requesting such information? I have never known a request for such information to be rejected.

Mr. HOLT. I think that would be a wise procedure, but, on the other hand, I believe such information should be made

available with respect to the different States. I may wish to have information concerning West Virginia. The Senator from Massachusetts may wish to have information with respect to Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. There should be separate pay-roll lists containing the names of those who are on relief and the names of those who are nonrelief employees. I think we ought to know how much we are paying to nonrelief persons to take care of people who need relief employment. I understand from what the Senator has been saying there is now no available information of that nature.

Mr. HOLT. Not at all, Mr. President. No one realizes more than I do how difficult it has been to get such information. That is not because of the fact that the General Accounting Office was unwilling to furnish it, but because we had to go over a pay roll containing thousands of names of persons in West Virginia in order to get the information desired.

Mr. WALSH. Is not every person who is employed as a foreman, or superintendent, or whatever job he may have, so employed in order to provide employment for those who are on relief?

Mr. HOLT. He should be.

Mr. WALSH. And is that not the basic principle of the legislation under consideration?

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Therefore we should know how many persons it is necessary to employ in order to take care of the relief cases. To aid those on relief is our object in appropriating funds and setting up the necessary organizations to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the Senator if he has by any chance made any comparison between the salaries received by the administrative personnel on W. P. A. in his State with the salaries received by the administrative personnel on P. W. A. in his State?

Mr. HOLT. No, I have not; because I found the P. W. A. to have a very clean record, I may say, in the State of West Virginia, and, of course, its set-up is entirely different. However, I know of men who were working for \$45 a month in private employment and who were put on W. P. A. at \$225 a month, and they received increases in their salaries of \$180 a month thereby. They were also given a Federal job.

Mr. PEPPER. I was very much interested as to what the comparison might show, in case we were to make a comparison between the two groups.

Mr. HOLT. There is a distinct difference between the P. W. A. and the W. P. A. The administrative force of the P. W. A. is decidedly smaller in numbers. One supervisor under the P. W. A. would take the place of perhaps half a dozen under the W. P. A. With regard to West Virginia, I know that the average relief foreman in West Virginia makes between \$15 and \$20 a month more than a school teacher with a college degree. We pay our school teachers far more than the average received by school teachers in the United States.

It is said that such information is not available and that we cannot obtain it. The only way we can find out the difference between the compensation paid relief and nonrelief workers is to obtain such information. That is the reason why I want it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the amendment which the Senator proposes to offer?

Mr. HOLT. The amendment I intend to offer reads:

The Administrator shall submit to Congress a list of all non-certified employees whose wage scale is more than \$1,000 annually. This list shall include the names, legal addresses, positions, and salaries of such employees.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not see why any reasonable person should object to such a requirement.

Mr. HOLT. Of course, this is not the time to offer the amendment. I was discussing salary increases and digressed to the other subject. However, it is time Congress knew

where the hundreds of millions of dollars it appropriates are going.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 12, before the word "None", to insert "(a)"; in line 13, after the word "be", to strike out "available"; after line 13, to strike out "(a) After June 30, 1939, for the operation of any theater project; or"; in line 16, before the word "for", to strike out "(b) After August 31, 1939" and insert "available after October 31, 1939"; and in line 19, before the word "This", to insert "(b)", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 25. (a) None of the funds made available by this title shall be available after October 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

(b) This section shall not prohibit the payment of wages or salaries accrued, or of nonlabor obligations incurred, in connection with any such project if the wages or salaries accrued or the obligation was incurred prior to July 1, 1939, or September 1, 1939, as the case may be.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado if he will not permit consideration of this amendment to go over until we have disposed of the amendment on page 5, to which we are to return later, and which provides for a contribution of 25 percent by a State toward sponsored projects.

Mr. ADAMS. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment on page 29, in section 25, will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 24, after the word "The", to strike out "Board" and insert "Commissioner", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 26. The Commissioner and the National Youth Administrator are authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in section 1 or section 2 hereof any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after the effective date of this joint resolution on account of damage to or loss of privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the Work Projects Administration or the National Youth Administration, as the case may be, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of \$500, or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 15, after the word "The", to strike out "Board" and insert "Commissioner", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 27. The Commissioner is authorized to call to the attention of the city, county, and State governments the unemployment situation of that city, county, or State, and to seek the cooperation of the State or any subdivision thereof in meeting the unemployment problem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 16, before the word "not", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the word "other", to strike out "sections" and insert "provisions", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 28. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any work project, employment, or relief aid under the appropriations in this title, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriations, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriations, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, or who disposes of, or assists in disposing of, except for the account of the United States, any property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this title or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 22, after the word "person", to strike out "entitled to or", so as to read:

SEC. 29. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to solicit, or knowingly be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the campaign expenses of any individual or political party from any person receiving compensation or employment provided for by this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 5, before the word "not", to insert "and"; and in line 6, after the word "other", to strike out "section" and insert "provisions", so as to read:

(b) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 14, after the word "election" and the period, to strike out "That no recommendations of any person who shall apply for office or place under the provisions of this act, which may be given by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, except as to the character or residence of the applicant, shall be received or considered by any person concerned in making any appointment under this act", so as to read:

SEC. 30. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible by this title, or any other act of the Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 10, before the word "not", to insert "and"; and in line 11, after the word "other", to strike out "sections" and insert "provisions", so as to read:

(c) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 4, before the word "not", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the word "other", to strike out "sections" and insert "provisions", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 31. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative or supervisory capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by this title, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the results thereof. While such persons shall retain the right to vote as they please and to express privately their opinions on all political subjects, they shall take no active part, directly or indirectly, in political management or in political campaigns or in political conventions.

(b) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by this title shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 2, to strike out the following title:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful non-Federal public-works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, the sum of \$125,000,000 transferred from section 1, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made under section 201 of such act of 1938, shall be available until June 30, 1941, and may be expended by the Commissioner of Public Works (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner"), subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or

other public bodies (herein called public agencies), or (2) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

(b) No amount available under this title shall be allotted for any project which, in the determination of the Commissioner, cannot be commenced prior to March 1, 1940, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to July 1, 1941: *Provided*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project enjoined in any Federal or State court.

(c) Under the funds available in this title, no grant shall be made in excess of \$225,000 or in excess of 45 percent of the cost of any project, and no project shall be constructed for lease to any public agency unless the Commissioner shall determine that the nonrecoverable portion of the cost of such project shall not exceed \$225,000 and shall not exceed 45 percent of the cost thereof.

(d) No moneys for a non-Federal project shall be paid from the funds made available by this title to any public agency unless such agency will require that at least 25 percent of the labor employed on such project will come from relief rolls if such labor in the opinion of the Commissioner of Public Works is available and qualified, and will not unreasonably interfere with the construction of such project, and unless and until adequate provision has been made, or in the opinion of the Commissioner is assured, for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

(e) Not more than \$2,875,000 of the amount available under this title may be used for administrative expenses of the Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, in connection with this title; such amount shall be available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth for such Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940. The Commissioner shall reserve from the amount available under this title an adequate sum for administrative expenses of the Administration in connection with this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

SEC. 202. Moneys realized from the sale of securities acquired by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Public Works Administration, or the proceeds of such securities, may be used by the Commissioner for the making of loans in connection with projects under this title, notwithstanding any previous limitation on the total amount of such securities or proceeds thereof that may be used for loan purposes.

SEC. 203. The Public Works Administration is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on July 1, 1939.

SEC. 204. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, as amended by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. No new applications for loans or grants for non-Federal projects shall be received by the Administration after September 30, 1939: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to applications amendatory of applications for projects received prior to October 1, 1939, and such amendatory applications shall be confined to projects, which, in the determination of the Commissioner, can be started and completed within the time limits specified in section 201 (b) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

SEC. 205. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, is this the public-works title? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is the public-works title.

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] intends to offer a substitute for title II. I should like to discuss the matter for a moment until he comes into the Chamber and offers his amendment.

As the House passed the joint resolution it provided that \$125,000,000 of the amount estimated for the Works Progress Administration should be earmarked for public works. The committee determined that the entire amount asked for by the President for the Works Progress Administration should be allowed, and then declined to provide any money out of the Treasury for a public-works program. It will, therefore, be necessary to adopt a substitute for the stricken title if there is to be any public-works program next year.

The Secretary of the Interior, who is ex officio Public Works Administrator, appeared before our committee and said, first, that he did not believe in the principle of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and therefore that the Works Progress Administration should have the full amount estimated in the Budget. We then questioned him as to the desirability of carrying on some kind of a public-works program during the next fiscal year, and asked him for the status of the present program. He stated that at the previous session of Congress \$965,000,000 was appropriated for such a program, of which \$200,000,000 was for Federal projects, the remainder being for loans and grants on the basis of

a 45-percent grant and a 55-percent contribution by the local community; that that program, translated into terms of work, meant that there was now proceeding in the United States nearly \$2,000,000,000 worth of work of all kinds in all sections of the United States; that that program would arrive at its peak in another 60 days; that the amount of employment would then begin to decline and by next winter it would be very substantially reduced, and that by next spring the program would be completed. It was his suggestion that if the Congress, as a matter of policy, determined that there should be a public-works program, its size should be about half the amount of money that we appropriated for the current fiscal year. Carrying out that idea, he suggested a program of \$500,000,000, \$400,000,000 to be for loans and grants, and \$100,000,000 to be for Federal projects.

The proposal which the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] intends to offer would carry out that suggestion. I am in favor of such a program. There is bound to be a period of transition between what we are now doing and what may be undertaken under the new suggestion recently submitted to the Congress by the President. The proposal of the President is that communities desiring to undertake public works of one kind or another, such as sewer systems, electric-light plants, street paving, erection of new buildings, city halls, jails, or whatever they desire, may come to the Federal Government with a proposal that the Federal Government guarantee their bonds at a very low rate of interest. That is what the suggestion amounts to. If the current rate of interest for the commercial use of money were 4 percent and the Federal Government enabled communities to obtain money at 2 percent, it would mean, in effect, a subsidy of the difference in interest they would have to pay if the Government did not guarantee their obligations. It is estimated that the subsidy over the period required would amount to between 12 and 15 percent. The idea is entirely new. It may have much merit. We do not know how it will work out until it is tried. Secretary Ickes testified that he had on hand about \$1,000,000,000 worth of projects which had been studied by the finance division and by the legal division and had gone through every process of examination, and that if he had the money he could undertake the work immediately.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I will yield in just a moment.

It has been suggested by those who are advocating the plan of guaranteeing bonds 100 percent that projects which have already been investigated and have gone "through the mill" might be taken up in that way. If there is any merit in the suggestion, I can see no harm in opening up the public-works program to receive new applications between now and next fall, as the House has proposed in the joint resolution; and then if the new scheme works, such projects can be picked up just as well as those that have already been approved.

I think there should be a cushion between the existing program and the new one; and I think the Secretary of the Interior, as Public Works Administrator, was wise in recommending a program of that kind.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Administrator does not think that \$125,000,000 is sufficient to carry out the program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no; there is no question about that. He has applications on hand for a much larger sum.

Mr. LUCAS. Yesterday when the debate on the joint resolution was commenced I briefly interrogated the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] relative to the \$125,000,000 which was stricken out of the joint resolution as it came from the House. I made the statement at that time that there were certain communities where applications had been made for certain Public Works Administration projects, which applications have been approved by the Administrator.

Mr. HAYDEN. What is true in Illinois is true in every other State in the Union.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to add this further information, which I think may be rather interesting to the Senator. In a certain community in Illinois a waterworks project application has been approved by the P. W. A. It is admitted by

those who know that the sanitary conditions in that city are very bad. Realizing the seriousness of the situation, the W. P. A. authorities, so I am informed, agreed to carry through this project providing the city authorities could get the P. W. A. to release jurisdiction over the project. An attempt was made to get P. W. A. to release jurisdiction, but the Administrator refused, and the conditions in that community are the same as they were last October when the application was approved. Certainly something should be done either to complete that project or to obtain the relinquishment of the authority of the Administrator of the P. W. A. and give the people in that community what they have been promised. Mr. President, there is apparently a conflict of authority between P. W. A. and W. P. A. upon that application.

Let me ask the Senator, Why should P. W. A., when there are no funds available for the completion of a project, withhold jurisdiction of the application when the W. P. A. in that community want to complete the project?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was just going to answer the question. Looking at it broadly, taking the country over, while it may work a hardship in some instances, it is a good rule, because if we do not have a rule of that kind, if a community elects to follow one course and then finds out that it cannot get it that way it can follow some other course, we are simply jumping from one agency to the other and having one agency compete against the other as to which will render the service. That situation has arisen in a great many places.

For that reason it is my understanding that the President issued the general order under which if a community elected in the beginning to take a project under W. P. A., then it could not change it over to a project under the Public Works Administration, or, if they elected to take a public-works project and found they could not get their money immediately that way, they could not change over to a W. P. A. project. There is reason in that idea.

There are exceptional circumstances, no doubt, such as the Senator has in mind, when there is a critical situation in the community, and it might be that the Administrator did not exercise the discretion that he had. He can release the project if it is necessary to do so, and perhaps he should have done it in the instance referred to. But will not the Senator concede that we do not need to set up two agencies, one competing against the other for projects?

Mr. LUCAS. I will concede that, providing there is money available to carry on any project from either one of the administrative agencies; but in the instance referred to the application was made last October. P. W. A. accepted that application immediately, but after they accepted the application, as I understand, they advised the community that they had no funds to carry it through. They have withheld it all this time and done nothing because they have no money, but, immediately after that, the W. P. A. came along and said, "If we can get the Administrator to relinquish jurisdiction, we will go ahead with the project."

Mr. HAYDEN. In that case the Senator presents an argument that, to my mind, if I were administrator, would be conclusive.

There is no question at all, so far as the local contribution is concerned, that the local community has to put up less money on a W. P. A. project than it does on a public-works project, on which the contribution is 55 percent. For that reason, taking the country over, the public-works projects have been of a higher standard and of a more substantial character. There is no doubt about that at all. What I am trying to say to the Senator is that we have been traveling these two roads, and we have accomplished great good on both of them. I think it would be a mistake totally and completely to cut off any hope of any kind of public-works projects, to allow no further applications to be received, and end it now, in the absence of some certainty as to how the new plan is to work. For that reason I am inclined to support an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what the committee proposes to do, as I understand, under the joint resolution as reported. Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, we have not finished the consideration of the committee amendments. Is the amendment now offered an amendment to a committee amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. MEAD. It is a substitute for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter in title II, beginning on page 35, proposed to be stricken out by the committee, it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful non-Federal public works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, there is hereby appropriated to the Public Works Administration (herein called the "Administration") in the Federal Works Agency, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$400,000,000, together with the balance of the appropriation made under section 201 of such act of 1938, not reserved for administrative expenses of the Administration and not now or hereafter expended pursuant to allotments heretofore made, which amounts shall be available until June 30, 1941, and may be expended by the Commissioner of Public Works (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner"), subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or other public bodies (herein called public agencies), or (2) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

(b) No amount available under this title shall be allotted for any project which, in the determination of the Commissioner, cannot be commenced prior to March 1, 1940, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to July 1, 1941: *Provided*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project enjoined in any Federal or State court.

(c) Under the funds available in this title, no grant shall be made in excess of 45 percent of the cost of any project.

(d) No moneys for a non-Federal project shall be paid from the funds made available by this title to any public agency unless and until adequate provision has been made, or in the opinion of the Commissioner is assured, for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

(e) Not more than \$9,750,000 of the amount available under this title may be used for administrative expenses of the Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, in connection with this title; such amount shall be available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth for such Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940. The Commissioner shall reserve from the amount available under this title an adequate sum for administrative expenses of the Administration in connection with this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

SEC. 202. Moneys realized from the sale of securities acquired by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Public Works Administration, or the proceeds of such securities, may be used by the Commissioner for the making of loans in connection with projects under this title, notwithstanding any previous limitation on the total amount of such securities or proceeds thereof that may be used for loan purposes.

SEC. 203. The Public Works Administration is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on July 1, 1939. On and after the effective date of reorganization plan No. 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President of the United States pursuant to the authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1939, all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Public Works Administration, and all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 204. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, as amended by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. No new applications for loans or grants for non-Federal projects shall be received by the Administration after September 30, 1939: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to applications

amendatory of applications for projects received prior to October 1, 1939, and such amendatory applications shall be confined to projects, which, in the determination of the Commissioner, can be started and completed within the time limits specified in section 201 (b) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939. That portion of section 201 (f) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 which reads 'for the completion (except liquidation) of the activities of such Administration,' is hereby repealed."

SEC. 205. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, the sum of \$100,000,000, to be expended at the direction of the Administrator, for the making of allotments to Federal agencies for the financing of Federal construction projects (including projects for making surveys and maps) in continental United States outside of the District of Columbia, and the acquisition of land for sites therefor, such projects to be selected from (1) projects authorized by law and (2) projects for the enlargement, extension, or remodeling of existing Federal plants, institutions, or facilities.

(b) No Federal construction project, except flood control and water conservation or utilization projects now under actual construction, shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds made available by this section unless and until moneys sufficient for the completion thereof shall have been irrevocably allocated or appropriated therefor.

SEC. 206. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry as to the legislative status.

The committee amendment which is before the Senate is simply an amendment to strike out certain sections of the bill. This is a substitute for the motion to strike out. In other words, it would take the place of it, and apparently would still leave in the bill the subject matter which the committee seeks to strike out, and would add to it other matter which is a duplication of much of that which is proposed to be stricken out.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, certainly a motion to perfect a section would have precedence over one to strike it out entirely; and that is all this motion is.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the committee amendment is merely a motion to strike out. I do not know just how a motion to strike out can be perfected. That is, if a substitute for it is proposed, and the substitute carries, the motion to strike out falls.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. And the words which were to be stricken out remain.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; parts of them do.

Mr. ADAMS. They will all remain; and then we shall have added what is practically a duplication, except in the figures. All I want to do is to get the parliamentary situation straight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado makes a parliamentary inquiry. A motion to strike out and insert has preference over a motion simply to strike out.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion now submitted, in the opinion of the Chair, is a motion to strike out and insert. If that motion is lost, then the committee amendment to strike out will come up; but, under the rules of the Senate, when a motion is made to strike out, and a second motion is made to strike out and insert, the latter has precedence. If that motion is lost, then the original motion of the committee to strike out is in order.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make a suggestion to the Senators who are proposing the amendment.

This amendment is the most important amendment we have. There are five or six pages of it, and I think those of us who have just come from the committee ought to have a little time to study the amendment. Therefore, I suggest that we go back to the committee amendments which have been passed over, and dispose of those, which will afford us an opportunity to give some thought to this amendment.

Mr. MEAD. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that that course is agreeable to me.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask, then, that we return to the amendments which were temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to laying aside temporarily this amendment, and returning to

those passed over? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendments passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first amendment passed over is on page 1, changing the title of the act.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the first amendment is allied to the amendment that we passed over. I think it should go over until the Senate acts upon the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be again passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. The next amendment passed over is on page 5, beginning in line 15, to insert the following:

(d) In administering the funds appropriated in this section, not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all projects hereafter undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used, shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, this amendment is the one which makes a requirement of a 25-percent con-

tribution by the sponsors, upon the basis that the sponsors within a State must average a 25-percent contribution.

Members of the Senate who were here in 1937 will remember that that was a subject of great controversy when the relief appropriation was made at that time. My recollection is that at that time the sponsors' contributions, as made during the previous year, amounted to about 15 or 16 percent. As a result of the arguments presented at that time, the Works Progress Administration has made a very definite effort and has achieved a certain amount of success in increasing the amount of the contributions.

For the fiscal year, ending on April 30 of this year, the amount was increased to 18.9 percent. For the 3 months ending April 30—that is, the last 3 months of that fiscal year—it was up to 20 percent. It is my understanding now that the contributions of the various States have amounted to 22.4 percent during the past 3-month period.

I should like, if I may, to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of the contributions which have been made by the various States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated work projects, by regions and States and by sources of funds
[Subject to revision]

Administrative region and State	July 1, 1938, through Apr. 30, 1939				Feb. 1, 1939, through Apr. 30, 1939			
	Total	Federal funds	Sponsors' funds		Total	Federal funds	Sponsors' funds	
			Amount	Percent of total funds			Amount	Percent of total funds
Grand total.....	\$2,168,046,403	\$1,758,641,331	\$409,405,072	18.9	\$616,599,376	\$493,493,305	\$123,106,071	20.0
Region I.....	154,475,043	129,594,227	24,880,816	16.1	42,782,565	35,506,894	7,275,671	17.0
Connecticut.....	23,918,402	19,716,674	4,201,728	17.6	6,282,281	5,272,215	1,010,066	16.1
Maine.....	6,424,872	5,041,470	1,383,402	21.5	1,861,431	1,518,431	343,000	18.4
Massachusetts.....	98,387,823	83,446,047	14,941,776	15.2	28,105,132	23,263,885	4,841,247	17.2
New Hampshire.....	7,242,820	5,868,228	1,374,592	19.0	1,894,959	1,565,088	329,871	17.4
Rhode Island.....	13,691,433	11,762,037	1,929,396	14.1	3,429,787	2,895,260	534,527	15.6
Vermont.....	4,809,693	3,759,771	1,049,922	21.8	1,208,975	992,015	216,960	17.9
Region II.....	522,573,808	428,947,857	93,625,951	17.9	149,542,431	117,869,996	31,672,435	21.2
New Jersey.....	86,176,657	67,060,776	19,115,881	22.2	23,289,316	18,169,959	5,119,357	22.0
New York.....	233,054,143	188,428,628	44,625,515	19.1	71,532,298	54,046,977	17,485,321	24.4
New York City.....	176,729,989	148,312,709	28,417,280	16.1	54,983,792	42,837,255	12,146,537	22.1
New York (excluding New York City).....	56,324,154	40,115,919	16,208,235	28.8	16,548,506	11,209,722	5,338,784	32.3
Pennsylvania.....	203,343,008	173,458,453	29,884,555	14.7	54,720,817	45,653,060	9,067,757	16.6
Region III.....	60,372,925	51,931,269	14,441,656	21.8	19,581,693	15,220,296	4,361,397	22.3
Delaware.....	2,361,019	1,870,455	490,564	20.8	642,311	491,496	150,815	23.5
District of Columbia.....	8,893,471	7,212,301	1,681,170	18.9	2,783,150	2,174,548	608,602	21.9
Maryland.....	10,739,572	8,103,460	2,636,052	24.5	3,026,219	2,295,710	730,509	24.1
Virginia.....	15,514,460	11,388,795	4,125,665	26.6	4,997,593	3,596,729	1,400,864	28.0
West Virginia.....	28,864,463	23,356,258	5,508,205	19.1	8,132,420	6,661,813	1,470,607	18.1
Region IV.....	632,930,457	535,283,909	97,646,488	15.4	167,186,451	141,921,330	25,265,121	15.1
Illinois.....	181,946,574	149,764,918	32,181,656	17.7	49,401,914	41,337,549	8,064,365	16.3
Indiana.....	69,161,749	56,165,410	12,996,339	18.8	18,539,037	15,173,742	3,365,295	18.2
Michigan.....	121,648,261	103,565,263	18,082,998	14.9	30,254,062	25,259,609	4,994,453	16.5
Missouri.....	66,143,600	55,086,776	10,456,824	15.8	18,073,863	15,078,218	2,995,645	16.6
Ohio.....	194,030,273	170,101,602	23,928,671	12.3	50,917,575	45,072,212	5,845,363	11.5
Region V.....	197,087,758	154,223,531	42,864,227	21.7	60,586,976	46,463,098	14,123,878	23.3
Alabama.....	29,187,469	22,744,926	6,442,543	22.1	9,245,738	6,996,570	2,249,168	24.3
Florida.....	28,079,876	22,504,907	5,574,969	19.9	9,358,720	7,003,993	2,354,727	25.2
Georgia.....	30,309,678	23,845,201	6,464,477	21.3	9,443,827	7,359,018	2,084,809	22.1
Kentucky.....	38,025,912	30,873,922	7,151,990	18.8	10,225,091	8,390,396	1,834,695	17.9
North Carolina.....	23,446,252	17,882,332	5,563,920	23.7	7,351,438	5,564,642	1,786,796	24.3
South Carolina.....	22,495,775	17,591,284	4,904,491	21.8	7,125,903	5,398,266	1,727,637	24.3
Tennessee.....	25,542,796	18,780,959	6,761,837	26.5	7,836,259	5,750,213	2,086,046	26.6
Region VI.....	162,802,130	125,907,354	36,894,776	22.7	51,031,769	39,058,942	11,972,827	23.5
Arkansas.....	23,109,796	19,642,638	3,467,158	15.0	7,264,223	6,288,773	975,450	13.4
Louisiana.....	27,957,374	21,699,823	6,257,551	22.4	9,357,630	6,769,562	2,588,068	27.7
Mississippi.....	23,287,841	16,835,317	6,452,524	27.7	7,423,117	5,160,997	2,262,120	30.5
Oklahoma.....	35,608,728	28,672,394	6,935,884	19.5	10,157,990	8,279,656	1,878,334	18.5
Texas.....	52,838,841	39,057,182	13,781,659	26.1	16,828,809	12,559,954	4,268,855	25.4
Region VII.....	208,127,996	160,984,976	47,143,020	22.7	57,996,956	45,453,882	12,543,074	21.6
Iowa.....	25,232,265	17,837,856	7,394,409	29.3	7,006,540	4,841,661	2,164,879	30.9
Kansas.....	22,991,078	17,537,156	5,453,922	23.7	6,464,431	4,942,235	1,522,195	23.5
Minnesota.....	55,454,646	43,581,552	11,873,094	21.4	15,167,193	12,413,144	2,754,049	18.2
Nebraska.....	21,380,867	16,884,505	4,496,352	22.4	6,010,353	4,782,467	1,227,886	20.4
North Dakota.....	10,466,339	7,855,089	2,611,250	24.9	2,800,874	2,257,035	543,839	19.4
South Dakota.....	11,396,406	8,235,827	3,160,579	27.7	3,542,066	2,458,204	1,083,862	30.6
Wisconsin.....	61,206,405	49,352,991	11,853,414	19.4	17,005,559	13,759,136	3,246,423	19.1

¹ Data for April are estimated.

Expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated work projects, by regions and States and by sources of funds—Continued

Administrative region and State	July 1, 1938, through Apr. 30, 1939				Feb. 1, 1939, through Apr. 30, 1939			
	Total	Federal funds	Sponsors' funds		Total	Federal funds	Sponsors' funds	
			Amount	Percent of total funds			Amount	Percent of total funds
Region VIII.....	\$68, 148, 117	\$52, 073, 077	\$16, 075, 040	23. 6	\$19, 565, 485	\$14, 851, 775	\$4, 713, 710	24. 1
Colorado.....	22, 592, 866	17, 626, 844	4, 966, 022	22. 0	6, 751, 581	5, 087, 962	1, 663, 619	24. 6
Idaho.....	7, 723, 217	5, 619, 001	2, 104, 216	27. 2	2, 411, 510	1, 777, 424	634, 086	26. 3
Montana.....	16, 200, 665	12, 772, 171	3, 428, 494	21. 2	4, 030, 581	3, 288, 239	742, 342	18. 4
New Mexico.....	8, 230, 851	6, 571, 538	1, 659, 313	20. 2	2, 479, 768	1, 856, 454	623, 314	25. 1
Utah.....	9, 846, 815	7, 094, 414	2, 752, 401	28. 0	2, 951, 529	2, 140, 063	811, 466	27. 5
Wyoming.....	3, 553, 703	2, 389, 109	1, 164, 594	32. 8	940, 516	701, 603	238, 913	25. 4
Region IX.....	157, 540, 626	122, 793, 150	34, 747, 476	22. 1	47, 215, 022	36, 362, 202	10, 852, 820	23. 0
Arizona.....	8, 885, 161	6, 351, 796	2, 533, 365	28. 5	2, 772, 650	1, 797, 180	975, 470	35. 2
California.....	93, 629, 084	74, 446, 751	19, 182, 333	20. 5	28, 474, 853	22, 504, 929	5, 969, 924	21. 0
Northern California.....	52, 700, 643	39, 833, 563	12, 867, 080	24. 4	16, 287, 842	11, 997, 441	4, 290, 401	26. 3
Southern California.....	40, 928, 441	34, 613, 188	6, 315, 253	15. 4	12, 187, 011	10, 507, 488	1, 679, 523	13. 8
Nevada.....	2, 187, 133	1, 361, 366	825, 767	37. 8	590, 581	387, 971	202, 610	34. 3
Oregon.....	14, 366, 755	11, 139, 732	3, 227, 023	22. 5	4, 395, 444	3, 374, 339	1, 021, 105	23. 2
Washington.....	38, 472, 493	29, 493, 505	8, 978, 988	23. 3	10, 981, 494	8, 297, 783	2, 683, 711	24. 4
Hawaii.....	2, 799, 448	1, 713, 826	1, 085, 622	38. 8	811, 763	486, 625	325, 138	40. 1
Not distributed by States ¹	—4, 811, 905	—4, 811, 905	—	—	298, 265	298, 265	—	—

¹ Includes data for central office projects, textile adjustment account, and Works Progress Administration supply fund account.

Source: Federal funds represent voucher payments reported by the Treasury Department; sponsors' funds based on reports of sponsors' certifications.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, to adopt this amendment and place upon the Commissioner of Work Projects the very arbitrary provision that he must require a 25-percent contribution averaged over the State and place in the hands of the General Accounting Office, as would naturally follow, the amendment which is proposed, the determination as to whether or not that rule had been complied with would make almost impossible the administration of the act.

There are some States in which, in a part of the State, the contribution is very low, and in other parts of the State it is high. It seems to me this amendment, which would simply bind the Commissioner without giving him any discretion, without giving him any right to determine as between the various projects, should be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, when this matter was discussed yesterday, at the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I stated that it was entirely agreeable to me to amend it so as to provide that the determination of compliance with the section should be left with the Commissioner to avoid the fear that the General Accounting Office might make the section difficult to administer. I therefore ask to have considered at this time an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk to be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "In" and in lieu thereof to insert "On and after November 1, 1939, in."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that is a perfecting amendment; and after discussing the matter with the Commissioner I think it is right that this section should not become operative until November 1. At this time the average contributions are 22½ percent. It is the statement of the Commissioner that by December he is convinced that the average contribution will be 25 percent. This amendment, therefore, would only incorporate in the law that which the Commissioner says he expects to be able to comply with by December 1.

The Commissioner, however, was interested in the matter suggested by the Senator from Kentucky.

Before discussing the matter further, I ask for a vote upon my amendment perfecting the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. In addition to the change suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, should there not be a change in line 17, substituting "thereafter" for "hereafter"?

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. I ask to modify the amendment by changing "hereafter" to "thereafter."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Ohio if he will not permit me to perfect the amendment and then discuss it.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I want to suggest, however, that the date be made January 1, 1940, instead of November 1939; and I desire to state my reasons.

Mr. BYRNES. The Commissioner states that in December he will have arrived at the 75-25 basis. I will agree to accept the Senator's amendment, and make the effective date January 1 instead of November 1.

Mr. TAFT. That is all I desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question regarding the effective date. Does the amendment include projects which have been approved, or projects to be approved after this date?

Mr. BYRNES. "Thereafter," as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So that a project approved the day before the effective date, even though it might not be finished, would be included?

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that the amendment does not affect individual projects at all. The amendment simply says that the total average contributions from a State after January 1 shall be, under the regulations adopted by the Commissioner, 25 percent—that is all—but not the individual projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is to be done with all the projects within a State if they do not measure up to that requirement? Are they to be abandoned?

Mr. BYRNES. Oh, no. The amendment merely says that in the case of all projects which are thereafter undertaken there shall be required from the State an amount which will make the average contribution 25 percent.

For instance, the contributions in the State of Colorado now are above 25 percent. This amendment would provide that they must be at least 25 percent; not that the authorities would demand less, but that the total contributions from Colorado should be at least 25 percent. As far back as April the contributions from Colorado were 24.6 percent. It does

not mean an individual project. In the case of one project the Administrator can make it 30; in the case of another, 20.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It means all the projects in the State.

Mr. BYRNES. The total; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. After all the projects in the State have been approved and accepted and are under way on January 1, or the effective date, whenever the amendment goes into effect, they all must be changed, and proceed on a different base altogether.

Mr. BYRNES. No; they would not. After January 1, in administering the fund under rules and regulations—which language is contained in an amendment I wish to offer, and which will be read in a few minutes—the Administrator would make the determination as to the total contributions on all projects in the State undertaken after January 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Projects undertaken after that date?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On projects under way after that date?

Mr. BYRNES. No projects undertaken thereafter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the answer to my question.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In my State, where it is found impossible to make an average sponsoring contribution of 25 percent, what would happen?

Mr. BYRNES. The amendment merely provides that thereafter the State administrator would be instructed to require of the State such contributions on all projects as would make 25 percent. That does not mean money. For the information of the Senator I will state that less than 5 percent of the sponsors' contributions are money. It represents equipment, rental of equipment, the furnishing of supervisory services. After that it would require the total in any State to be 25 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the Administration has constantly raised the amount of sponsoring contributions throughout the country?

Mr. BYRNES. Not exactly. What has occurred is this: It was up as high as 27 percent, and last year it was down somewhat. Now, as I have stated, it is 22½ percent. It varies in the different States. In Idaho it is about the highest.

Mr. MURRAY. It varies according to the economic conditions in each State?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. In Ohio it is 11 percent; in Idaho it is about 30 percent; in Mississippi it is 30 percent; in Pennsylvania it is about 10 percent. It depends on conditions. The Administrator does not require States such as Pennsylvania and Ohio to put up as much as States such as Idaho and Mississippi. Instead of having it left to discretion, in the haphazard manner as it is at present, it would be provided for in the law. What would happen would be that the Administrator would be saved much trouble. The Administrator would have the opportunity to say "It is the law, and therefore I must try to secure the required percentage."

Mr. MURRAY. Inasmuch as the communities have advanced their contributions, and raised them up to the figure of 22½ percent, does not the Senator think it would work a great hardship on the country suddenly to advance the figure to 25 percent, especially in view of the continuance of the economic conditions which have been prevailing?

Mr. BYRNES. The best answer, in the first place, is that it is not going to be done suddenly. In the second place, the Commissioner says he is going to have it done by December, and this would not require it before January.

Mr. MURRAY. My information is that in many of the communities it is going to be absolutely impossible for them to make further contributions to the sponsoring funds, that is to say, increase them any further; that they have reached the point where they cannot possibly go any further.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it comes to this: It depends on the voice of the Administrator and his persuasiveness. In some States, where there are high-powered salesmen with affidavit faces, they can, with tears in their voices, picture conditions so terrible that they can "get by" by putting up 10 percent. When they get to the Senator's State, where they have no man selected for the purpose working on this particular subject, and who does not present the case in so tearful a manner, they make it put up 30 percent.

The Commissioner will now have the advantage of saying, "The policy has been stated, and I think for the State at large you ought to put up this amount." It does not affect every community. If there is a poor community, it can put up 10 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not speaking of my own State. In my State we have constantly increased the sponsoring contribution, and have succeeded in getting it up to a very high figure.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator is speaking of the low-percent-age States, such as Pennsylvania and Ohio.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; some of the large States, or the conditions reflected in the testimony submitted by the mayors of New York and Cleveland and Boston.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator overlooks entirely the provisions of the amendment, because the condition in one city does not affect the situation. There was a time when New York City did not want to put up more than one-half of 1 percent. Fortunately that time has passed, and, by reason, I think, in great measure, of the action of the Senate committee, it is now putting up more than 25 percent, so that it does not affect New York City at all.

Mr. MURRAY. My information is that the administration of the W. P. A. is going to find it impossible, as the result of this amendment, if it is put into operation, to carry out the program.

Mr. BYRNES. I discussed the matter with the Commissioner this morning, and that is not his view of what would happen if the amendment I am about to submit should be adopted. The amendment reads:

The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

That is the language used in one or two agricultural acts where the question of fact is to be determined, and to avoid conflicts between the General Accounting Office and the Department. If this amendment shall be adopted—and I hope it will be—the Commissioner says he will have no trouble in administering the act. Without it, he would have.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator knows I am entirely in sympathy with his efforts, which have extended over a long period of time, in an attempt to work out some definite rule. As I listened to the Senator discussing what we know to be a fact—that people come from various towns and States and municipalities, high-powered salesmen, with the affidavit face, as the Senator said—that is true, and that is happening all over the country—I was just wondering whether we might be shifting responsibility within the State to the communities in the State, where the high-powered salesman with the affidavit face in the community able to put up the money does his work, while in a poorer community there is no one to represent them, and they will be imposed on for a higher sponsorship contribution. Has the Senator thought of that?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes, because in every State necessarily there is a different sponsoring contribution. The bill provides that the Commissioner shall endeavor to act equitably as between communities, and the determination in the State must be left, of course, to the State Administrator. There can be no way of avoiding that. The small community, having no one to represent the sponsor, is not as effective as is the representative of a large city. But the best we can do is to provide for the effect as to States. I know it will be a step forward.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator's perfecting amendment to do only with the effective date of the act, or does it affect its provisions?

Mr. BYRNES. Not only that, but it gives to the Commissioner, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, the power to determine compliance, in order to avoid any question which the General Accounting Office might raise.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, following the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico, and in keeping with his inquiry, is it not true that the 25 percent applies to the State?

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Following that thought, the Administrator may reduce the percentage of contribution in one community within a State, but that would necessarily entail raising the contribution to other communities, because the general average over the whole State must be 25 percent?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. Let me show how it would work in the Senator's State. As far back as April they were demanding of Nevada 34 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. For the Nation they were demanding 22 percent. Nevada was asked to pay 12 percent more than the general average, and I think more than any other State in the Union.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. The amendment would not disturb that situation anyway, because in the State of Nevada the Administrator, of course, would have the determination as between the communities in Nevada. It would not affect that situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. It would not reduce the contribution we have been making.

Mr. BYRNES. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, the minimum must be 25 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; but the law does not say how high it can be made.

Mr. McCARRAN. With reference to the other matter raised by the question of the Senator from New Mexico, suppose, we will say, one community in Nevada, by its persuasiveness, was able to get away with a 10-percent contribution. Then the Administrator could raise the contributions of other communities as they applied for projects so as to make a level of 25 percent at least. Is not that true?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. Of course, in the State of Nevada it would not affect the matter at all, because the contribution of that State is put so high.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is too high now.

Mr. BYRNES. The highest in the Union. I suppose that is a tribute to the wealth of Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; and it is a tribute to the patriotism of Nevada. We do not want to drain the Federal Treasury any more than we have to.

Mr. BYRNES. I think that is the best illustration that could be given. It is too high. They ask 34 percent from Nevada, and 10 percent from another State.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very glad to have the Senator from South Carolina say it is too high, and I hope his statement will be observed.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 5, line 23, after the words "may be" and the period, the following:

The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner and his determination made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him shall be final and conclusive.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to address myself to the pending amendment. It seems to me there will be two or three inevitable effects, even when the amendment is perfected as the Senator from South Carolina proposes to perfect it. In the first place the amendment would make it impossible in the future to have any Federal projects. Every project would have to be a State project, because every State would have to put up at least 25 percent of the cost of the project constructed within the State.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there was no such intent, and because it has been suggested that such a construction might be placed upon it as the Senator from Florida has placed upon it, I intend to amend by inserting "non-Federal." It was suggested to me to make it specifically "non-Federal." The word "non" should be inserted in the language.

Mr. PEPPER. That would be a very helpful amendment. I am glad the Senator from South Carolina proposes to make that change, so that it will be possible hereafter to continue Federal projects.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the provision would have no effect whatever upon Federal projects.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say that the next vice which I think the amendment in any form has is that it lays down a rule of rigidity rather than a flexible rule. Heretofore the Administrator has been working toward a satisfactory relationship between the Federal and the State contributions, and the figures which have just been presented show that he has done a good job, and constantly has been requiring a larger contribution from the States and the sponsors of the several projects. Therefore, I feel that to lay down a rigid requirement—that is to say, that every State must contribute a minimum of 25 percent—would impair the quality of flexibility which I believe a program of this sort must have to be effective.

In my State, in spite of the fact that, according to the figures presented, we paid 25 percent, so that on the face of it we would suffer no detriment by the adoption of the amendment, yet I am told from reliable sources in the administration in my State that four-fifths of our projects, which have already been approved by the President and which are ready for execution, would be handicapped or would be retarded if the provision in question were in effect.

I know that the Senator from South Carolina proposes to change the language so that it will not restrict individual projects; but it restricts the whole State. If four-fifths of the projects are below the 25-percent minimum, the other one-fifth will have to be high enough to bring the whole contribution of the State up to the level of 25 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. If I understood the Senator correctly, he said the provision would apply to projects now under construction. That would not be so, by reason of the change of the word "hereafter" to "thereafter."

Mr. PEPPER. I mean to say that the rule would apply to four-fifths of the projects that have already been approved by the President but upon which construction has not yet begun.

Mr. President, the determination of the amount of a State's contribution should be based on the nature of the project. In my State the State university is getting some very fine dormitories and university buildings under the W. P. A. program. It is a permanent construction, which will be worth something next year, 10 years, and 25 years from now. That kind of construction should be encouraged and not discouraged. On such projects an average of 50 percent has to be put up in my State. Of course, that makes the contribution high. So the effect of the amendment would be to encourage the cheaper projects and the less-permanent projects at the expense of the permanent and the valuable projects which would stand year after year as monuments to the value of the program.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment in any form will not be agreed to, because experience does not show necessity for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to read into the Record two telegrams, one from the mayor of Cleveland and another from the mayor of Toledo, regarding the proposed amendment. I read first the telegram from Mayor Burton, of Cleveland:

Understand proposed Senate amendment to W. P. A. appropriation bill provides for 25-percent contribution from local subdivisions to cost of projects. Respectfully submit that provision requiring flat or arbitrary percentage contribution from local governments is extremely unwise because of various types of projects now in operation in different sections of country. No subdivision in Greater Cleveland is able to meet this proposed requirement.

I now read a telegram from the city manager of Toledo:

Regarding 25-percent local contribution W. P. A. projects, inability to raise funds thus required would mean reduction of available man-months work from present 120,000 to 40,000 for Government fiscal year 1940. This would mean lay-off 6,666 men immediately, most of whom would go on relief, for which our funds are entirely inadequate.

Mr. President, it happens that Ohio is one of the States in which the W. P. A. needs are the largest, and in which the State contribution is the smallest on a percentage basis. If Senators will examine the figures submitted by the Senator from Washington, they will see that in Ohio the contribution was 12.3 percent last year, and, instead of improving this year under the Administrator's assistance, it is lower. It is now 11½ percent. That is not because Ohio does not contribute a very substantial sum. I think if Senators will consider the total sum contributed, over twenty-three million, for sponsors' shares of these projects they will find that, in proportion to population, that is as large a percentage as any State puts up, or substantially the same as any State puts up. The difficulty is that the unemployment in Ohio is greater. That is why it seems to me that a 25-percent flat percentage is not a fair percentage to require.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The telegrams read by the Senator indicate that the mayors of those two cities are under the impression that the 25-percent limitation applies to local projects. Of course, it does not. It is the average for the State. A local project may not have more than 10 percent or 15 percent local contribution, but some other project would have to go above 25 percent in order to make the average 25 percent.

Mr. TAFT. How is the State going to apportion the 25 percent to one city and not to another city? How will the authorities determine what the percentage shall be? Or must we call the legislature together before the 1st of January in order to provide a new allotment of State funds to municipalities and counties in Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is up to the administrator of the W. P. A. in the State, and not up to the legislature. The legislature does not as a rule appropriate moneys to match Federal funds. They are put up largely by local communities.

Mr. TAFT. Our legislature, however, is attempting to work out that problem and contribute some part of the money from the State. Other parts come from localities.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to draw any invidious comparison, because there may be some States whose percentage is lower than that of Ohio. I understand the average in Ohio is about 11 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Eleven and one-half percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whereas the average in the whole country is 23 percent.

Mr. TAFT. The only reason I can see why we have a larger percentage of W. P. A. in Ohio is because there is more unemployment in Ohio. The reason the percentage is low is not because the contribution of the State is small, but it is because of the tremendous need for W. P. A. work in the State of Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be determined on the basis of the aggregate of the contributions made by the local communities.

Mr. TAFT. I said before the Senator came into the Senate Chamber that Ohio contributed \$24,000,000 during the last fiscal year. Compared to Illinois, for instance, which contributed \$32,000,000, it is approximately the same on the basis of population. Compared to \$44,000,000 contributed by New York it is almost exactly the same percentage.

Our contribution has been approximately as large as that of any other State in the United States. The difficulty is that the unemployment is so great. I do not know why that is. I have not been able to discover why we should be the prize unemployment State, but apparently we are. Apparently the city of Cleveland has the highest percentage of unemployment of any city in the United States.

Mr. President, I can think of no reason why every State should be treated the same, why every State should be required to put up 25 percent. Let one State put up 25 percent and another State put up 10 percent because of different needs. But now there must be a flat 25 percent. What reason is there to suppose that every State is in the same position from the standpoint of unemployment? In addition to W. P. A., the actual money spent on direct relief in Ohio is in percentage as high or higher than in any other State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has mentioned the aggregate amount contributed by Illinois and New York. What is the percentage of contribution locally to the projects?

Mr. TAFT. In Illinois it is 17.7 percent and in New York it is about 19 percent. But there are more people on W. P. A. today and more people unemployed in the State of Ohio than in the State of New York or in the State of Illinois or in the State of Pennsylvania, any one of which has a great deal larger population than has the State of Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the contribution locally in Pennsylvania?

Mr. TAFT. Fourteen and seven-tenths percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. With States such as Illinois, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania contributing from 11 to 19 percent locally, it must be true that many other States are contributing a great deal more than 23 percent in order to make the average for the whole country 23 percent.

Mr. TAFT. That is true. It is also true, as was pointed out by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], that where unemployment is very heavy and there is the necessity of providing people with sufficient money to live on the money must be made to go further. There must be fewer permanent projects and more digging and other work which provides employment for more persons. Consequently, it is undoubtedly true that the type of projects in the States where unemployment is heavy is not so permanent as in States which contribute more money. The more permanent the project, I think, the more reason there is to ask the State to contribute something to the project; but the justification for relief is to prevent starvation. Relief is an absolute necessity. It is not fundamentally a Federal project at all. It is a necessity; and if the necessity is greater in one place than in another, I do not see why we should require any arbitrary percentage.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think the pending amendments to the amendment are an improvement upon the report of the committee. As I understood the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], he stated that the Administrator had advised him that under the provisions of the committee amendment as amended—in case his pending amendment is adopted—the Administrator could administer these provisions. However, I assume that his statement relates primarily to the question of whether or not it is feasible and practicable from the Administrator's standpoint for him to enforce the requirement. I take it he did not intend by that statement to indicate that the Administrator felt that the provision suggested would be workable so far as the over-all picture of W. P. A. operation is concerned.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive how the 25-percent average sponsor's contribution per State can operate in any way except to impede the program. I think we must bear in mind that the employment of millions of persons is a going operation, scattered all over the United States in practically every community. It is an operation which requires the employment of individuals upon projects if they are to receive the wages which stand between them and destitution.

Mr. President, I am not an expert on the administration of the W. P. A. so far as its technical details are concerned, but it seems to me perfectly clear from the standpoint of a layman that if we lay down an arbitrary requirement of a 25-percent average it will inevitably result in delay in the approval of projects, because the Administration would have to keep a weekly or monthly average—perhaps a daily average—of sponsors' contributions within a State. When a large municipality, for example, puts forward a project and needs that project approved in order that the people who are certified for employment may be transferred to the new project from a project which is coming to completion, it will be necessary, as I see it, for the Administrator to weigh the contribution for the new project as against the State average. Often there may be a situation in which it will be necessary to delay the approval of a project which falls below the 25-percent requirement in order that some community remote from the particular project under consideration may be induced to sponsor a project which will be sufficiently above the 25-percent average so that the project in the first community may be approved and the average maintained.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think the point made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is a sound one. We must remember that urban and industrial communities, as well as the Federal Government, have been carrying a very heavy financial burden over the long economic crisis. I know that in my own State there are industrial communities which are reaching the end of their financial ability, either through taxation or by borrowing, to provide sponsorship in any such proportion as 25 percent. The average of my own State in the average table happens to be 19.1, but that does not mean that some industrial communities where unemployment has been a terrific burden ever since 1929 are not below the 19.1 percentage in providing their share of sponsorship.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that from any aspect we consider the amendment in its entirety, if it shall be adopted we shall impose a very difficult administrative problem. We shall be endangering the continuity of employment, which is so essential for those who need work; and all we shall gain, according to the sponsors of the amendment, is an increase of 3 percent in sponsors' contributions over the present national average.

I submit, Mr. President, that under those circumstances, and in view of the varying incidence of unemployment among industrial communities, we should not fix an arbitrary standard of this kind. I think all will agree that the Works Progress Administration has been bringing all possible pressure upon the communities to increase their percentage of sponsorship; and the record will show, if Senators will take the trouble to examine it, that so far as the Nation as a whole is concerned there has been a constant increase in the contributions of sponsors of W. P. A. programs.

In addition, Mr. President, we must take into consideration the fact that so far as the problem of direct relief is concerned the Federal Government has withdrawn any assistance to the localities, counties, and States. So, in addition to what the localities are putting up in the way of sponsor contributions for W. P. A. projects, they are carrying a tremendous financial burden in the way of meeting, without Federal assistance, the staggering burden of direct relief for unemployables and for those employables who have never been taken on by the W. P. A., although many of them have been certified for months and months as being eligible for such employment.

So I plead with the Senate to reject this amendment and not to impose the difficult administrative problem which I

venture to predict, if the amendment is adopted, will slow up the approval of projects in large urban communities to the point where the entire functioning of the W. P. A. program may be endangered, with the result that an increasing load will be dumped upon the communities for the local taxpayers to carry largely through property taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I feel obligated to read a telegram which was not sent directly to me, but was sent to the majority leader, a copy of which was transmitted to me by Mayor LaGuardia, in reference to the same question which is now under consideration. I read the telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 27, 1939.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I have sent the following telegram to Senator BARKLEY:

"W. P. A. appropriation bill as reported will practically make all worth-while projects in cities impossible. Many municipalities simply cannot comply with sponsorship requirements as now provided in committee bill. Art and theater projects cannot be locally sponsored for many reasons well known to committee. Purpose of W. P. A. is to provide work. The pending bill will not do it in its present form. I am speaking for all cities. Do not forsake unemployed now."

F. H. LA GUARDIA, Mayor.

The telegram carries out the thought which has been so ably expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I wish to join with those who are urging the rejection of the amendment, because I think the basis of requiring a State to pay an inflexible sum of 25 percent, irrespective of the needs of the particular State, is not in accordance with the philosophy of the W. P. A.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, confirming what the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] says, I have received several similar messages from the mayor of Boston. I find that the general sentiment of officials of the larger cities in the country is that the suggested provision would prove very burdensome. A table which was called to my attention yesterday indicates that the percentage of contributions made in the State of Massachusetts last year was 13 percent. A jump to 25 percent would be extremely burdensome to municipalities which are already overburdened with taxes and which already have a very heavy relief load.

Mr. WAGNER. I will say, Mr. President, that I happened to be present in the Appropriations Committee when the mayor of Boston testified and explained to the committee the difficulties under which he is now laboring. I am not pleading especially for New York, for New York may be able to carry the burden; I do not know; but in some of the other communities such as Boston, in view of the evidence the mayors gave to the committee, how they can possibly contribute 25 percent I do not know. I think that statement will apply to many other communities.

If this inflexible imposition is to be written into the bill, it will be exceedingly burdensome, and will simply mean that many of those now employed will be absolutely uncared for.

I was one of those who were originally associated with the legislation to provide relief, together with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the late Senator Costigan, of Colorado. That was during the Hoover administration when relief legislation was first proposed. Then we did not divide the money so much for each State and provide that each State should contribute so much. We insisted, as the Congress insisted, that the money should be provided where it was needed.

Now, unfortunately, some States are suffering more than others. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asserted a few moments ago that his State is suffering from unemployment to a greater extent perhaps according to population than is any other State in the Union. It would be unfortunate if that State, because of the tremendous unemployment there, and the need that exists there, was not able to make the contribution of 25 percent throughout the State. It would simply mean that they could not sponsor projects. What

the outcome would be, I cannot foresee, unless they should put all the unemployed upon relief, and that would be a burden the State could not carry, for it is necessary to have the cooperation of the Federal Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to sustain what he is saying to the extent of observing that the mayor of Detroit—and I think the mayor of every other industrial city in Michigan—testified precisely as the Senator from New York has stated? I therefore want to join with him in the statement he is making.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the Senator very much. What I am attempting to urge is that we should not attempt to change the philosophy of the law. It was contemplated that aid should be given according to need. Now it is proposed, irrespective of need, that the States shall be compelled to contribute 25 percent, and if they do not do so they cannot get any aid from the Government at all. I think it would be a very risky proposition, and I hope it will be rejected.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AS SECURITY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take from the calendar and to have considered at this time a bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee at the request of the Federal Reserve Board. The bill permits for 2 years longer the use of United States bonds as security for rediscount at the Federal Reserve banks. It has to pass before Friday night; otherwise, the rediscounting of the banks will be greatly retarded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state by title the bill referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2618) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1939," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1941."

REGULATION OF COMMERCE IN PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1302) to make permanently effective the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935, as amended, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, to strike out line 8 and insert:

amended by the act approved June 14, 1937 (50 Stat. 257), is further amended so as to read:

"Sec. 13. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 30, 1942."

On page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 18, inclusive; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to continue in effect until June 30, 1942, the act entitled 'An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes,' approved February 22, 1935, as amended."

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I will take a moment of the time of the Senate, if I may, to call attention to a possibility that the pending legislation may not be passed in time to have the President sign it before the expiration of the present law. That situation is causing great worry to millions of W. P. A. workers throughout the country. In addition there are some further worries. In the Works Progress Administration there are a great many employees who have accumulated leave, which, technically, will expire and be wiped out if the pending bill shall not be enacted before Friday night.

So, if it is in order, and if it is not out of order, I ask unanimous consent that I may now introduce a joint resolution which, if adopted, would continue the functions of these agencies in the event that the pending measure should not be passed. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection I will say to the Senator, if he will yield, that I have conferred with the leaders of the other branch of Congress in respect to the matter to which he refers. In the event that it becomes apparent that the pending bill cannot be enacted and signed by the President by Friday night, a joint resolution has already been drawn and is ready to be introduced and passed, if it becomes necessary. However, we are all hoping it will not become necessary, because if we pass a joint resolution continuing these agencies for another month or 2 months or 6 weeks or even 2 weeks, the Senator realizes that then we may relax our efforts to secure the passage of the pending measure. It is not desirable to pass a continuing resolution unless it is absolutely necessary in order that there may be no lapse of time after midnight on Friday. I think the chances are probably 99 to 1 that we will be able to have the pending measure enacted and signed by the President before Friday night.

Mr. MALONEY. I am very hopeful that the majority leader is correct in his view, and I am quite in accord with what he says. My only interest in the matter was in having a resolution before the Appropriations Committee in the event it was necessary. I shall be guided entirely by the suggestion of the majority leader.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry as to legislative procedure? Can the Senate initiate such a resolution or should it not come from the other House?

Mr. MALONEY. I think we can initiate it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no question that the Senate can initiate such a resolution if the law in question is not a tax measure, in which event the other House must initiate it.

Mr. ADAMS. Legally, of course, the Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But customarily the House does originate resolutions of this kind, and I will say to both Senators it is already understood that, if it becomes necessary, a resolution will be thus originated in the other House.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to ask the majority leader now what he would prefer I do? Does he desire that I withdraw the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is all right. Of course the Senator may introduce it and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations if he so desires.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) continuing the functions of the Works Progress Administration and certain other agencies beyond June 30, 1939, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire, in connection with the statement I made a few moments ago, to invite the attention of the Senate to page 26 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolution 83. A table appears on that page which is designated as table 8,

which purports to set forth, by States and by sources of funds, the expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated projects through November 30, 1938.

As I scan through this table, I note that approximately 38 States, 2 or 3 of them being very close to a 25-percent contribution, will have an increase in their contributions, and about 10 States will probably have a reduction.

The contributions made by the States vary from 11, 12, and 13 percent to as high as 30 percent. It would seem to indicate that some of the States will have a very substantial increase in their contributions.

I ask that this table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 8.—Expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated projects, by States and by sources of funds through Nov. 30, 1938

State	Cumulative through Nov. 30, 1938				5 months ending Nov. 30, 1938			
	Total expenditures	Federal funds	Sponsors' funds		Total expenditures	Federal funds	Sponsors' funds	
			Amount	Percent of total expenditures			Amount	Percent of total expenditures
Total.....	\$6,195,050,364	\$5,206,312,670	\$988,737,694	16.0	\$1,093,521,558	\$897,892,694	\$195,628,864	17.9
Alabama.....	67,946,931	53,744,645	14,202,286	20.9	13,496,711	10,725,337	2,771,374	20.5
Arizona.....	26,006,875	19,243,186	6,763,689	26.0	4,457,965	3,374,784	1,083,181	24.3
Arkansas.....	54,032,946	44,622,390	9,410,556	17.4	10,543,625	8,963,121	1,580,504	15.0
California.....	319,970,376	268,857,632	51,112,744	16.0	45,114,675	36,372,125	8,742,550	19.4
Colorado.....	71,885,189	58,672,590	13,212,599	18.4	10,989,501	8,886,189	2,103,312	19.1
Connecticut.....	69,334,885	56,732,834	12,602,051	18.2	12,493,553	10,237,698	2,255,855	18.1
Delaware.....	5,968,386	5,184,750	783,636	13.1	1,216,288	976,775	239,513	19.7
District of Columbia.....	20,139,667	17,370,617	2,769,050	13.7	4,112,805	3,541,446	571,359	13.9
Florida.....	62,751,844	50,555,122	12,196,722	19.4	13,096,345	10,642,366	2,453,979	18.7
Georgia.....	69,684,688	56,327,417	13,357,271	19.2	14,288,818	11,281,609	3,007,209	21.0
Idaho.....	22,899,371	16,411,498	6,487,873	28.3	3,696,446	2,640,731	1,055,715	28.0
Illinois.....	462,489,908	384,307,671	78,182,237	16.9	94,675,647	78,500,384	16,175,263	17.1
Indiana.....	191,693,147	162,740,041	28,953,106	15.1	36,657,738	29,853,039	6,804,699	18.6
Iowa.....	68,984,079	51,953,223	17,030,856	24.7	13,157,554	9,292,076	3,865,478	29.4
Kansas.....	83,391,354	65,065,008	17,326,346	21.0	11,492,568	8,871,517	2,621,051	22.8
Kentucky.....	89,426,684	71,022,357	18,404,327	20.6	19,750,483	15,851,358	3,899,125	19.7
Louisiana.....	74,443,999	60,989,887	13,454,112	18.1	12,532,421	10,199,240	2,333,181	18.6
Maine.....	18,706,403	14,948,800	3,757,603	20.1	3,233,604	2,445,232	788,372	24.4
Maryland.....	26,183,300	20,598,393	5,584,907	15.4	5,415,841	4,129,872	1,285,969	23.7
Massachusetts.....	266,762,260	249,006,370	17,755,890	13.2	49,278,572	42,928,371	6,350,201	12.9
Michigan.....	257,036,733	214,437,947	42,598,786	16.6	68,002,613	59,562,953	8,439,660	12.4
Minnesota.....	151,872,055	125,146,242	26,725,813	17.6	28,494,091	22,213,379	6,280,712	22.0
Mississippi.....	63,421,627	40,104,091	23,317,536	24.9	10,261,383	7,837,087	2,424,296	23.6
Missouri.....	172,604,112	148,643,807	23,960,305	13.9	33,878,768	29,145,682	4,733,086	14.0
Montana.....	41,277,536	34,411,245	6,866,291	16.6	8,944,195	7,019,248	1,924,947	21.5
Nebraska.....	69,681,807	46,272,250	23,409,557	22.5	10,690,754	8,356,795	2,333,959	21.8
Nevada.....	6,501,457	4,534,309	1,967,148	30.3	1,171,959	700,961	470,998	40.2
New Hampshire.....	19,805,649	16,044,870	3,760,779	19.0	3,770,713	3,075,370	695,343	18.4
New Jersey.....	249,746,408	208,701,496	41,044,912	16.4	44,458,161	34,677,580	9,780,601	22.0
New Mexico.....	24,036,235	19,863,932	4,172,303	17.4	4,248,708	3,425,695	823,013	19.4
New York.....	957,897,170	846,489,627	111,407,543	11.6	114,695,270	95,112,278	19,582,992	17.1
North Carolina.....	62,730,411	40,347,484	22,382,927	23.5	11,112,574	8,431,837	2,680,737	24.1
North Dakota.....	37,914,201	30,428,436	7,485,765	19.7	5,353,859	3,839,543	1,514,316	28.3
Ohio.....	452,033,485	393,923,650	58,109,835	12.9	104,386,777	91,316,129	13,070,648	12.5
Oklahoma.....	108,321,802	84,719,322	23,602,480	21.8	17,391,551	14,095,880	3,295,671	18.9
Oregon.....	44,858,092	36,363,621	8,494,471	18.9	7,066,557	5,476,325	1,590,232	22.5
Pennsylvania.....	628,514,369	565,058,086	63,456,283	10.1	104,375,269	90,737,611	13,637,658	13.1
Rhode Island.....	35,248,891	29,181,329	6,067,562	17.2	7,731,210	6,716,131	1,015,079	13.1
South Carolina.....	47,172,123	37,345,357	9,826,766	20.8	10,340,452	8,437,514	1,902,938	18.4
South Dakota.....	42,263,313	35,141,026	7,122,287	16.9	5,236,147	3,908,201	1,327,946	25.4
Tennessee.....	70,026,648	46,791,125	23,235,523	33.2	11,941,851	8,683,521	3,258,330	27.3
Texas.....	140,242,552	105,513,240	34,729,312	24.8	24,329,529	17,726,908	6,602,621	27.1
Utah.....	29,573,286	22,034,972	7,538,314	25.5	4,768,460	3,429,423	1,339,037	28.1
Vermont.....	10,579,012	8,018,757	2,560,255	24.2	2,280,305	1,779,897	500,408	21.9
Virginia.....	44,610,890	34,930,027	9,680,863	21.7	7,310,169	5,360,028	1,950,141	26.7
Washington.....	92,253,260	77,044,955	15,208,305	16.5	19,593,237	15,145,860	4,447,377	22.7
West Virginia.....	88,011,258	74,520,200	13,491,058	15.3	14,760,250	11,813,994	2,946,256	20.0
Wisconsin.....	160,317,091	132,811,632	27,505,459	17.2	31,276,989	25,348,247	5,928,742	19.0
Wyoming.....	11,709,374	8,283,691	3,425,683	29.3	1,815,088	1,201,318	613,770	33.8
Alaska.....	20,743	20,743	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hawaii.....	7,349,554	5,115,752	2,233,802	30.4	1,436,765	867,305	569,460	39.6
Virgin Islands.....	4,015	4,015	—	—	—	—	—	—
Central office.....	4,944,808	4,944,808	—	—	200,845	200,845	—	—
Central textile account.....	-9,231,805	-9,231,805	—	—	-7,473,983	-7,473,983	—	—

Source: Federal funds represent voucher payments reported by the Treasury Department, sponsors' funds based on Works Progress Administration State office reports of sponsors' certifications.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have received telegrams from the mayors of the largest cities in the State of Pennsylvania with reference to the pending amendment. The cities include Philadelphia, Reading, Erie, and Pittsburgh. I desire to read to the Senate a telegram I received this morning from the mayor of the city of Pittsburgh. It is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., June 27, 1939.

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The new W. P. A. bill as reported by your Senate subcommittee is a great improvement over the House bill, but one feature is included which I hope you will use your best efforts to remove from the final enactment. That is the arbitrary setting up of a 25-percent sponsor's contribution on all projects, which the conference of mayors informs me is provided for in the committee's report. There are a great many very useful W. P. A. projects which require a sponsor's contribution of much less than this amount, particularly grading and drainage jobs on streets and playgrounds which con-

stitute the bulk of the city of Pittsburgh's W. P. A. program. I think I can fairly say that if the 25-percent year-round average is included in the bill, that the city of Pittsburgh will be forced to cut very sharply the number of W. P. A. projects which it sponsors and thus the total number of employees on W. P. A. here will be much reduced.

Our financial condition is such that we cannot afford to spend more than \$100,000 a month for the sponsorship of W. P. A. projects. We have averaged, roughly, 10 to 12 percent of Federal W. P. A. expenditures and so it is easy to see that if the figure is moved up to 25 percent that the W. P. A. employment on city-sponsored projects will be cut in half or more.

I sincerely hope that in view of this condition confronting your home city that you will do everything within your power to remove this crippling restriction.

CORNELIUS D. SCULLY,
Mayor, City of Pittsburgh.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. As I understand, that is the amendment postponing the time when the provision is to take effect?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's statement is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the second amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, line 17, after the word "projects", it is proposed to strike out the word "hereafter" and insert "thereafter."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 23, after the period, it is also proposed to insert the following new sentence:

The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to be sure that I understand this matter. I think perhaps there is a little confusion on the subject in the minds of other Senators also.

On page 16, in section 11, provision is made for the Commissioner to allocate not to exceed \$50,000,000 to other Federal agencies for certain purposes there prescribed. That is not dissimilar from the provisions which have been made in all the other relief measures, is it? I address my question to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BYRNES. No; it is practically the same.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the usual provision?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. The next question is, under the existing law it has been possible to have a category of projects to be called Federal projects; that is to say, projects which might be sponsored by the Works Progress Administration alone, without any cosponsor or joint sponsor. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator should amend the amendment he has been discussing and let the 25-percent provision apply only to non-Federal projects, I wish to know whether it would be possible in the future for the W. P. A. to sponsor a project which perhaps would require a cosponsor, but with respect to which the amount to be contributed by the cosponsor should not be prescribed by law or regulation. Would that be possible?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, if I understand what the Senator has in mind, it has reference, of course, to section 25 of the joint resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. I think the specific prohibition in that section, if it remains, would prevent the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. But the thing I am interested to know is this: Suppose the W. P. A. says, "We will sponsor an arts program. That is to say, we are willing to sponsor it if there will be a cosponsor with us." May not the two or the three, or whatever number may be involved, sponsor that project without its being subject to the 25-percent provision on the previous page?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not think so. I think the art projects the Senator has in mind would be on the same basis as all other projects, and that if such a project were desired by the city of Jacksonville, say, Jacksonville would have to sponsor it. It is true that the representative

of the Mayors' Conference apparently does not understand this amendment, and he speaks of the individual contributions. The city of Jacksonville could sponsor an art project, and, if the Administrator approved it, could put up 5 percent, or could put up the equivalent of 5 percent—because, in the history of these things, less than 5 percent is now put up—and as long as the State of Florida was putting up 25 percent, as it is now putting up 25 percent, it could go ahead.

Mr. PEPPER. But there is a difference between the city of Jacksonville, Fla., on the one hand, initiating an arts project or any other kind of a project, enlisting the approval of the W. P. A., getting the W. P. A. contribution to be applied and having the project constructed, and on the other hand, the W. P. A. initiating a program or project of broad application, and, before it can operate in any State, requiring that the State shall cooperate in a certain degree with the program.

Mr. BYRNES. There certainly is; but I submit to the Senator that the only way in which he will remedy the situation to which he refers is by striking out the three lines on page 29. So long as those three lines remain in the joint resolution, providing that no funds are available for any project sponsored by W. P. A., it could not be done.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to suggest a technical disagreement with the Senator from South Carolina as to that interpretation of the language. If the project were sponsored solely by the Works Progress Administration, without any cosponsor, that would be true; but the language which the joint resolution already carries says that none of these funds shall be available for projects which are sponsored solely by the W. P. A.

Mr. BYRNES. Let us see if the Senator and I cannot agree. If a project is not sponsored solely by the W. P. A., then the funds in this joint resolution are made available—there is not any question about that—regardless of whether the sponsor is the city, the county, or the State. There is no question about that.

Mr. PEPPER. That is my interpretation. I am very much interested in this subject, and I want to be sure that that interpretation is the one which is understood by the Senate when this amendment is adopted, if it is adopted.

Mr. BYRNES. I do not think there is any question about that; but whenever we reach that stage in the consideration of the joint resolution I shall be glad to express my view about the matter. Apparently some Members are opposing the provision who are opposed to any art project or theater project, and some Members are in favor of Federal projects without any contribution or sponsorship at all; and that is a very controversial matter. As I see it, however, it would not be affected by the pending amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I think if the Senator should perfect his amendment by putting in the words "non-Federal," it would make the matter clear.

Mr. BYRNES. As I have stated heretofore, and stated to the Senator from Florida, that was my interpretation of the amendment, and I thought I asked to modify the amendment some time ago by inserting the word "non-Federal." Certainly I intended to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. On page 5?

Mr. BYRNES. On Page 5, line 16, after the word "all," to insert "non-Federal."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is modified as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. PEPPER. The word "Federal" there is construed to mean a project sponsored solely by the Federal Government?

Mr. BYRNES. That is the way it always has been construed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may I ask a question at that point? I am very much interested in this matter, and I should not want to have any confusion afterward. Providing the requirement for a 25-percent contribution remains in the legislation as it now stands, may a project be sponsored by the W. P. A. jointly with some local authority?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; there would be no change in that respect. When the Senator refers to a project being spon-

sored jointly, I assume that he means in the same manner in which those matters are now conducted.

Mr. WAGNER. There are certain projects which the W. P. A. may itself conduct without any sponsorship from any locality.

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct. That is prohibited by the language on page 25.

Mr. WAGNER. That cannot be done if the joint resolution is passed as it now stands. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES. If it is passed with the section on page 25, it could not be done.

Mr. WAGNER. So if a sponsorship should come from a locality, assuming it to be an art project, would it nevertheless be in the classification of non-Federal projects?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; it would have to be.

Mr. WAGNER. I hope the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is listening to this discussion, because I do not want him to be confused.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Florida, as I understand, is not confused about it. Any project that is sponsored by a State or any subdivision of a State is not a Federal project.

Mr. WAGNER. It is not a Federal project?

Mr. BYRNES. It is a non-Federal project.

Mr. WAGNER. Under this legislation as it now stands, can we have a purely Federal project?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; of the character described in the \$50,000,000 section, limited to Federal agencies.

Mr. WAGNER. That is limited to certain Federal agencies?

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct, and that is all.

Mr. WAGNER. That could not include art projects?

Mr. BYRNES. It could not as I interpret it. I talked to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] about the matter a moment ago. It could not be done unless the President allotted to some agency of the Government some department's money for that purpose.

Mr. WAGNER. Some other agency than W. P. A.?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. So that unless section 25 is amended that would be the construction?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not think there is any doubt at all about it, as long as that specific proposition remains in the joint resolution.

Mr. WAGNER. Then such a project would come within the 25-percent requirement?

Mr. BYRNES. It would be on the same footing as all other projects.

Mr. President, I regret very much that I cannot get some features of this matter over to the Mayors' Conference, and, I fear, to some of my colleagues. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] read a telegram from the mayor of Cleveland which clearly indicates that the mayor has read some newspaper statement misleading in character. He says the provision in question will require a municipality to put up 25 percent of the cost of a project; and from two or three telegrams read by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] from mayors of cities in that State, I am sure there is a misunderstanding. We know how such a misunderstanding occurs. The Mayors' Conference now have offices here, and they have a representative. This is not the first time I have found that the representative sends out a telegram, and the mayor of my town telegraphs me, and the mayor of another Senator's town telegraphs him, and if a mistake appears in one telegram it appears in all. It is just a question of whether the gentleman who now represents the mayors for the purpose of getting money out of the Federal Treasury understands the matter. If he does, all right, well and good. If he does not understand it, then we receive the telegrams, and they are all wrong.

This provision does not apply to the municipality. Insofar as the State of Pennsylvania or any other State is concerned, proceeding as the Administrator now does, he may show to Cleveland, as he has shown to Cleveland ever since these programs have been in effect, the favor of not requiring them to put up as large a contribution as is required of other cities in the State of Ohio and as is required of small

communities. That is true of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas.

Insofar as this provision goes, the Administrator would proceed as he now does. How does he proceed? He has a sewing-machine project, for instance. He requires a contribution of not more than 10 percent. How is that 10 percent provided? By the rental of a building, or at most by material; not by cash, and because he thinks that project should not be required to put up a large contribution, he does not require it.

Then there may be a schoolhouse to be built, and, because of the ability of the school district, having issued bonds, to put up more, the Administrator will require them—as I know he does in my State—to put up 45 or 50 percent. They put up the 45 or 50 percent in material and in supervision of men. They can take one project and require 50 percent; they can take a white-collar project and require 5 percent; but so long as they provide the total from the State of 25 percent, which is going to be required anyway, according to the Administrator, by December, this provision could be administered.

It is said that the Administrator would have trouble in administering the provision. I discussed that matter with the Administrator this morning. I would not want to misquote him, but I am satisfied he would prefer to have no restraint upon the exercise of discretion by him. He would prefer not to have any amendment at all; which is not unusual. I never have seen the official in the executive department who would not prefer that we hand him an appropriation without requiring that he comply with any restraint directed by the Congress. But when I asked him about the administration, he said that if he had had the language which I have added, he would have had no difficulty in administering the law. The only thing he requested was that I make the effective date 3 months from now, and at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio I extended it even to the first of the year, because I believe it is important to the Administrator, after all, to put this principle into effect.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to commend the Senator for the amendment he has offered, which I think will be most helpful in the administration of the law. I understood the Senator to say yesterday that the average contribution by the States is now 22 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. Twenty-two and a fraction percent.

Mr. WALSH. And that the Administrator says after December it will be 25 or more, under the present law.

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. But the pending joint resolution fixes the amount of the contribution at 25 percent. In several States would not that be an increase over present contributions?

Mr. BYRNES. I did not understand the Senator's question clearly, but the present contribution is twenty-two and a fraction percent, and the Administrator says that by December he is going to require a contribution of 25 percent.

Mr. WALSH. Can he do that under existing law?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; or he can lower it, or he can require one State to put up 10 percent and require of another State 35 percent or 50 percent. In the case of Nevada he requires 34 percent. In the case of Ohio—and I did not bring this out, but the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Kentucky did—he requires 10 percent. It is only a question whether or not, in order to attain some degree of uniformity, we should require that a State shall put up a minimum of 25 percent. Then the State regulates the contributions within the State, as the State administrator sees fit, in order to secure the 25 percent.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has clarified the situation by his statement, but I still am convinced that the amendment would mean to many States an increase over the present contribution.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that it would mean to some States an increase there can be no question, and my contention is that it should mean that. Let us see what occurs. Today we have something we have never had before; we have

an organization of mayors. I do not blame the mayors for their activities. The mayor of any municipality knows that he is going to stand for reelection, and when he stands for reelection, the mayor wants to cite his accomplishments. He tells his people something to this effect: "I put up this building, this stadium. I put up this recreation park. Look at the waterworks I put in this city; and, my fellow citizens, I want to tell you that I got it for nothing. Not one dollar did it cost you. It did not come out of your city taxes. I got it without raising your city taxes. I went down to the city of Washington and put up an argument there to the Administrator, and, with the help of the State administrator, I got them to let me put up only 10 percent. How did we put up the 10 percent? By putting some people on the job to exercise supervisory direction, and we charged up the services of the supervisors at so much a day. That did not cost you any money, because you had the supervisors, anyway."

"What else did I do to put up the 10 percent? I provided the use of some of the city's equipment. I took the concrete mixer and got a credit of \$50 a day. Over here in the other city, how did they come out? The mayor did not stand in as I did, and he got but \$25 a day for their concrete mixer. I put a tractor on the job. Reelect me, and I will go down to Washington and get something for the city."

Now we are confronted with the situation that when they cannot come in person, telegrams pour in, and they are going to be received from my city and from every other city, saying "Don't hamstring me. Still leave me an opportunity to get this money. I don't want to put up any."

Is that right? Consider the case of the P. W. A. today. They submit us a statement that they have a billion and a half dollars of applications from the municipalities of this country, asking for the privilege of putting up money in order to get a billion and a half dollars out of the United States Treasury, and they say, "If you will give it to us today, if you will write into this measure this P. W. A. provision and let us get the money, we will put up 55 percent in order to get a 45-percent grant." Let them get into a taxicab and ride across this town from one Government office to another, and they get poor on the way, and by the time they reach the Administrator's office they are crying that they cannot put up 10 or 15 percent because of the terrible conditions which exist at home. As a result they get a favor from one Department of the Government, when they are crying for the opportunity to put up 55 percent in order to get 45 percent out of the Treasury.

I want the Senate to decide whether or not we shall endeavor to say how little they must put up. Some of them are not willing to put up equipment and are not willing to provide supervision, and today they are not putting up more than 5 percent, and they do not want to do that.

This provision would result in some uniformity, and make the people of this country more satisfied with the P. W. A., which has done and can do much good. We should write some such provision into the law, instead of leaving it to the Administrator to say, "I like the State of Arizona, and because I like the State of Arizona and like the Senator from Arizona, it has to put up but 11 percent. But I do not like this other State, and that State will have to put up 30 percent."

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, does not the Federal money come from the same place where the cities and towns get their money?

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator could convince the people of that, our difficulties would be greatly lessened, but the people do not believe it. The people believe that when they get money from Washington, it comes from Santa Claus, that they are will never have to do anything about it, and therefore that it is merely a question of saying, "So long as it is going to be spent, I might as well get mine." If I were the mayor of Kalamazoo I would say that I would get more of it, that I knew it was going to be spent, and if I did not get it, the Senator from Massachusetts would be getting it, and therefore I would get as much as the other fellow, or

more. No mayor will run for office in a municipality hereafter without bragging about the good bargain he obtained.

In the early days we thought the brake on expenditures was in the Congress of the United States, and that the spending department was in the executive branch. By the high-powered methods now resorted to, that has been changed, so that the only brake to be exercised will be exercised by the executive department, and Congress will be running away with itself to see how much it can give to other people.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I was interested in the Senator's picture of the lobbying mayors. I have been in legislatures, and know something about it myself.

In the case of the city of Cleveland, I do not think his story is a fair statement of what happened. I talked with the mayor of Cleveland this morning for over half an hour, and discussed the whole situation with him. I was familiar all last year with the situation in Cleveland. I know how much they can put up. This is a question of figures, and I say that if we require them today to put up 25 percent, they will have to cut their works projects in half, and that is not because they are not putting up money. The people of the city of Cleveland voted an extra levy of seven mills, which makes their tax rate today the highest in the State of Ohio. The need exists. It is all very well to say that these are general conditions, but I say that here is a specific condition, a condition under which they cannot afford, by any method I can discover today, at least, or the Administrator can discover, so far as that is concerned, to put up 25 percent.

We have introduced a bill on the relief proposition requiring a contribution of one-third. If they have to put up 25 percent on W. P. A. projects, and they pay the whole cost of their relief, which is very considerable, in addition to the W. P. A., they are going to pay nearly half the cost of relief under this plan.

I say that under present conditions of unemployment, under the tremendous expense they are put to in order to take care of unemployment they cannot afford to do it. If we are going to leave it wide open to an administrator to say, "In Cincinnati you have to put up 30 percent and in Cleveland 10 percent," we will have the same conditions existing inside of the States that we are trying to get away from by having uniformity throughout the Nation. The provisions are not carried far enough. If 25 percent is what is wanted, make it 25 percent for everyone.

I think the principle is an unsound one. I think the administrator should go into a case of need and determine what is the actual need in the particular case.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the Senator's question is a long one. First of all I wish to say that the Senator from Ohio has said that the administrator ought to have the right to go into each case. That is what is provided for. I think the Senator still believes that the provision would require the city of Cleveland to put up 25 percent. I have been trying to tell the Senate that the provision applies to the State, and if the administrator of the State of Ohio, who knows more about the condition in the city of Cleveland than anyone in Washington could possibly know, believes its story, then he can permit projects to be undertaken in the city of Cleveland without raising the percentage. If that were done it would lessen the pressure that is brought to bear. Without wishing to say anything about any one city, I will say that that city has been the most active of any that I know of with respect to the general proposal. But the other cities of Ohio make no such complaint, and the other cities of Ohio could pay a little more to make up the 25 percent, pay it in the way I suggest they should pay, by services and by equipment. I know a little about the city of Cleveland. I dislike to go back to

it. The Senator, however, will admit that when they had an election there on the question of changing the constitution so as to permit the city to raise more taxes for relief, the people of Cleveland voted it down.

Mr. TAFT. There is a constitutional limitation, but a city may vote to impose a tax in excess of the constitutional limitation. While we have a 10-mill limitation, Cleveland has voted, and today has a tax rate of 30 mills.

Mr. BYRNES. When was that election?

Mr. TAFT. In 1932, I believe.

Mr. BYRNES. And has not the city of Cleveland voted on it since then and voted against the increase?

Mr. TAFT. Cleveland has nearly always voted for the additional levy. I cannot speak of what has happened since 1932, because I do not know.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. First of all I agree that, through the efforts of the Senator who has the floor, the legislation before us has been considerably liberalized.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes, it has.

Mr. MEAD. I am very much interested in a character of project which would fit into a category which would make it wholly a Federal project. I recognize the fact that the inhibition contained in the joint resolution prevents 100-percent-sponsored P. W. A. projects. But it does not prevent a Federal project if the project can secure Federal sponsorship. For instance, I am speaking of projects on Indian reservations, national parks and reserves, game refuges, emergency airports and projects that have to do with the Army and the Navy. For the RECORD I will say that I recognize the fact that, while we prevent W. P. A. 100-percent-sponsored projects, there is a possibility of some agencies joining in sponsorships, but I am wondering if there are any funds available, and, also for the RECORD, I should like to know how these projects will be prosecuted.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I can only say that the language in the House measure covering the \$50,000,000 for Federal projects is the same as has heretofore been used. I think the Senator from New York is interested in the same question about which the Senator from Florida has been interrogating me.

Whether the House language on page 25, which definitely prohibits the projects referred to, or the language now proposed be adopted, I do not see how any part of that \$50,000,000 could be appropriated for the arts projects in which the Senator is interested, unless some agency of the Federal Government had the authority to undertake them and could secure approval of the President. That would have to be done, just as it has always been done. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. MEAD. For the RECORD, again I will ask whether the Senator knows of any authorization which would permit an agency of government other than the W. P. A. to sponsor a Federal project?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not believe any such authorization exists. When I was discussing the question with the Senator from Florida this morning I wondered what the effect of the language would be. Even if the President allotted money to the Department, I do not see how the Department could undertake to sponsor the project unless it was authorized by law to do the particular thing.

Mr. MEAD. Would the Senator favor the insertion in the measure of a sum of money earmarked and authorized under specific language for certain Federal projects, limiting it to a reasonable amount?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that has nothing to do with the amendment I have suggested. I have always opposed the absolute prohibition carried in the House provision. I do not believe that the arts projects could be placed on the same footing with all other projects. That is my position with respect to the matter. I find, as I said a while ago, that some Members of the Senate are in favor of Federal art projects and some are opposed to them. I want the language to be

more specific. I think they should be treated as all other projects are treated.

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator will yield further, I will say that section 25 (a) on page 29 states that—

None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be available after October 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

I have in mind the possible earmarking of a reasonable sum of money that would permit W. P. A. to act as a co-sponsor of certain projects, and I have in mind accepting from the Federal arts projects, as a contributing share, the revenues derived from the operations of such projects or receipts taken in at the box office.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, while discussing the provision on page 5, a number of questions were asked me about the theater project. I wish to say to the Senator that the Senate will have to vote on that question. The interest displayed by the Senate makes certain that a vote will be taken. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote its convictions one way or the other. The Senate can vote to strike it out, and then it will proceed just as it is now proceeding, or it can amend by inserting a provision such as the Senator indicates.

I do not like to make a suggestion about a matter in which the Senator from New York is interested, but it seems to me the thing to do is to meet the issue and have a vote on it. I can advise the Senator that I have been told by Members who object to the language proposed by the Senate committee that they want to restore the House language, with the positive prohibition against any art project of any kind, and that a vote will be had on that question. The Senator from New York, the Senator from Florida, and others are in favor of it, and they will doubtless present their views, and we will have a vote on the question in a short time.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I recognize the fact that the proposed legislation which has been sponsored by the Senator is far more liberal than the measure that came to the Senate. But I have in mind the jeopardy that not only the Federal art projects will be in but all Federal projects, such as those affecting Indian reservations, national parks, and game refuges.

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President, they are in a different category. I should not want my statement to be misconstrued. The national-park projects are authorized by law. If it is seen fit to appropriate a certain sum out of the Federal \$50,000,000 appropriation, to the Interior Department for national parks or anything else, it is made a Federal project. Such projects, I repeat, are authorized by law. If the Senator could find some department which is authorized by law to operate a theater project, it could do so. I do not know of any. The \$50,000,000 is available to the departments.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to have that \$50,000,000 which is available to the departments, dealt with by language which would make the provision sufficiently liberal to include Federal projects similar to the Federal Arts Project and others in the category that I mentioned, such as emergency airports, which may be covered by existing law.

Mr. BYRNES. Airports are not affected. They are covered by law. I suggest to the Senator from New York that he ought to meet that issue directly. If he wants to meet it, let him offer an amendment to suggest it directly, because I am afraid he will not get at it in any other way. I do not know of any specific law authorizing the other departments to do this thing.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the suggestion, and I really believe we ought to meet it as the Senator suggests, and that we ought to appreciate the fact that the Senator from South Carolina has already liberalized existing law, but that we have in mind a further liberalization of the law.

Mr. BYRNES. The provision does not go as far as the views of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. We ought to have in mind the acceptance of sponsorship by W. P. A., which is now prohibited by law, and that sponsorship might come as the result of receipts which accrue in the prosecution of a project. I think it would cover such a situation as we might find upon investigation that State law or municipal ordinances would not permit sponsorship of the type of project we have in mind. Therefore, to get around that difficulty it occurs to me that we ought to have in the law some validation of that particular type of project.

Mr. BYRNES. We have to do that or knock out the whole of section 25.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to correct the statement of the Senator that the other cities in Ohio are not in the same situation as Cleveland. Akron, Youngstown, and Toledo are in exactly the same situation as is Cleveland. While Cincinnati, Columbus, and Dayton are better off, they are hardly in a position to assume their share of sponsorship.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have listened with peculiar interest to the colloquy which has been carried on between the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. I believe that what the President and all of us have in mind; that is, permission to the W. P. A. to be cosponsor of projects of greater than local significance, may be preserved by an amendment to the committee amendment on page 5, as amended, adding the following proviso at the end of line 23:

Provided, That the limitations of this subsection shall not apply to projects on which the Works Progress Administration is a cosponsor.

Mr. President, that proviso would make it possible for the Works Progress Administration to sponsor projects which have a significance broader than State lines or any particular locality; but at the same time there would be imposed a limitation upon the authority of the W. P. A. by requiring, as section 25 does, that no project could be sponsored solely by the W. P. A. That is to say, the W. P. A. would have to obtain some competent cosponsor for every project it initiated, but the amount of the contribution to be made by the cosponsor would be determined by the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. President, I believe that all of us recognize that certain projects have a national significance, and that they could with propriety be initiated and sponsored by the Works Progress Administration, the national agency. I am perfectly willing to concede, as the joint resolution indicates, that there should be some limitations upon that authority, and that in every case the W. P. A. should be required to enlist the cooperation and the aid of some other competent sponsor.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask the Senator if he will not offer his amendment to section 25, which he could just as well do.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President. I do not wish to do that, because that would leave the impression that the only thing to which the amendment would be applicable would be the arts program. There are many projects which are truly national in their scope, or certainly regional in their significance, and which as a practical matter could only be initiated with propriety by the W. P. A. I am perfectly willing to agree to any reasonable limitation in amount, if the Senator would care to suggest such a limitation.

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President; I am not interested in it at all.

Mr. PEPPER. We have the safeguard of the President's approval; we have the safeguard of the Administrator's approval, which is required before such projects can be initiated; and we have our past experience to show that the authority to initiate projects has not been abused. Even more important than that, we have the debate which has occurred on the floor of the Senate, which will certainly be a moral admonition, if not a legal suggestion to the Administrator to be limited in the initiation of projects to those

which would meet the common approval of the people of the country. Therefore I offer the amendment which I have suggested to the amendment reported by the committee, as amended.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 5, beginning in line 15, as amended, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 5, beginning in line 15, as amended, was agreed to, is reconsidered. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, at the end of line 23, in the committee amendment as amended, it is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided, That the limitation of this subsection shall not apply to projects on which the Works Progress Administration is a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 15.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I express the hope that the amendment to the amendment will be rejected. The matter of the theater project can be met, and should be met, in the consideration of section 25. It can be considered and determined by the action upon that section. Having the Administrator of the Works Progress Administration pass upon cosponsorship of the Works Progress Administration and some local government would present an entirely new proposal, which really has no relevancy to the committee amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator aid me in the matter of language? Can one be a cosponsor for himself? Can he be a partner of himself? Can he be his own father?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that is the point that is bothering me. The amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is not necessary. In a few minutes we shall reach the section under which this thing can be discussed, and Members can vote their convictions on it one way or the other and settle it in a very short time. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment, as amended, will not be agreed to. I hope the committee amendment will not be confused by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 15.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment on page 5, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the word "thereafter" to add the words "approved to be", so that the line would read, "projects thereafter approved to be undertaken within any State, Territory", and so forth.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have the committee amendment, as amended, stated in its entirety?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The committee amendment, as amended, reads as follows:

(d) On and after January 1, 1940, in administering the funds appropriated in this section not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all non-Federal projects thereafter approved to be undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used, shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political

subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be. The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, we are about to vote on the question whether or not we will agree to the committee amendment as amended. Some Senators who have expressed views about this amendment are absent from the Chamber. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	King	Reed
Andrews	Downey	La Follette	Reynolds
Ashurst	Frazier	Lee	Russell
Austin	Gerry	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Gibson	Logan	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gillette	Lucas	Slattery
Barkley	Green	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Guffey	McKellar	Stewart
Bone	Gurney	Maloney	Taft
Borah	Hale	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Harrison	Miller	Tobey
Bulow	Hatch	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hayden	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Herring	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hill	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Holman	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Overton	Wheeler
Connally	Hughes	Pepper	White
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the benefit of those who have just come into the Chamber, may we have the amendment as amended stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as amended.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to insert:

On and after January 1, 1940, in administering the funds appropriated in this section, not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all non-Federal projects thereafter approved to be undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia as the case may be. The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina if I am correct in interpreting that amendment to mean that if all the projects which are possible under this appropriation should be approved by the 1st day of next January, the 25-percent limitation would not apply?

Mr. BYRNES. It would not apply except as to projects approved after January 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that, if the approvals prior to that date represented the entire sum available, this amendment would not apply to any of them.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; assuming the premises to be true.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

I understand, if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. For that reason I feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHONEY (when the name of Mr. SCHWARTZ was called). I announce that my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained from the Senate by reason of illness.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who is absent on account of illness. I understand he would vote as I intend to vote. So I am at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. LOGAN. I have a special pair with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained in various committee meetings.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I am advised that the Senator from North Dakota is temporarily detained on departmental business.

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I am advised that he would vote as I intend to vote on this amendment. I, therefore, feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent. On this vote he is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—51

Adams	Connally	Holman	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Donahay	Holt	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Bailey	Gibson	King	Russell
Bankhead	Gillette	Lee	Smathers
Barkley	Green	Lodge	Stewart
Borah	Gurney	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Hale	McKellar	Tobey
Bulow	Harrison	Miller	Townsend
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	White
Capper	Hill	Pittman	

NAYS—24

Andrews	Frazier	Maloney	Schwellenbach
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Slattery
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Minton	Taft
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Truman
Davis	La Follette	Neely	Wagner
Downey	Lucas	Pepper	Walsh

NOT VOTING—21

Barbour	Ellender	Nye	Vandenberg
Bilbo	George	Schwartz	Van Nuys
Brown	Glass	Sheppard	Wiley
Caraway	Logan	Shipstead	
Chavez	Lundeen	Smith	
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Thomas, Utah	

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE
REPORT

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5610) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 11, 12, 13, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40, 42, 51, 55, 72, 73, 85, 86, 97, 98, 99, 100, 107, 114, 115, 119, 128, and 137.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 22, 37, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 53, 79, 82, 83, 84, 91, 92, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 112, 113, 116, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, and 136, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$249,960"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "purchase (including exchange) of passenger-carrying automobiles, \$10,000; and for purchase (including exchange) of three passenger-carrying automobiles for the executive office, \$5,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$78,860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$689,803"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$189,160"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,191,930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the language stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "\$312,500: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be so apportioned and distributed over the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and shall be so administered, during such fiscal year, as to constitute the total amount that will be utilized during such fiscal year for such purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "\$3,824; in all, \$9,724"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$490,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,186,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$21,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$37,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$21,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$226,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$154,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$144,530"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$290,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$511,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the language stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"For the acquisition by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of approximately one hundred acres of land in Prince Georges County, Maryland, as a site for the National Training School for Girls, \$10,000: *Provided*, That the title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a satisfactory price cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of said land the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland, and expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation made for the purchase of said land."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$40,205"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$40,705"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$29,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "In expending appropriations contained in this Act under the caption 'Public Assistance', not more than the following monthly amounts shall be paid therefrom: Emergency Relief of Residents: Single persons, not more than \$24; family of two persons, not more than \$30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age not more than \$6; and not to exceed a total of \$60 to any one family; Home Care for Dependent Children: Family of two persons, not more than \$30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age not more than \$6; and not to exceed a total of \$60 to any one family; Assistance Against Old Age Want, and Aid for Needy Blind Persons: Not more than \$30 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SPONSOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

"For amount required by the District of Columbia as sponsor's contributions toward Work Projects Administration nonconstruction projects for free lunches for necessitous school children, sewing, household service, housekeeping aides, adult education, and recreation, including the purchase of food, supplies, materials, streetcar and bus fares, rent, equipment, rental of equipment, personal services, and other necessary expenses, \$177,500, together with not to exceed \$12,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1939 contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1938."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 15, 20, 21, 34, 39, 41, 50, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 101, 117, 122, 127, 129, and 133.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
CARTER GLASS,
ELMER THOMAS,
EDWARD R. BURKE,
WILLIAM H. KING,
GERALD P. NYE,
STYLES BRIDGES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

ROSS A. COLLINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

Mr. OVERTON. I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana what disposition was made in the conference report of the provisions dealing with old-age assistance.

Mr. OVERTON. In the case of old-age assistance the Senate increased the appropriation over the bill as it came from the House, and in conference the Senate receded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to describe the two provisions? What was the Senate provision and what was the provision of the House which caused the disagreement?

Mr. OVERTON. There was an increase of the appropriation by the Senate. I do not recall the exact amount. The House refused to yield, and the Senate receded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that the provision insisted upon by the House, and to which the Senate conferees have yielded, is such as to make it impossible for aged persons who receive only \$30 per month assistance and have no other income of any kind to derive any benefit from the distribution of foodstuffs by the Surplus Commodities Corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I do not so understand the provision of the conference report. There is a limitation, inserted by the House, of \$48 per family; and the agreement reached in conference was that there should be a certain limitation on each one of these appropriations—namely, for old-age assistance, dependent children, and the blind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was that limitation a personal limitation or was it a limitation on the total amount?

Mr. OVERTON. It is a personal limitation, beginning with a certain amount set forth in the report, and increasing it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator state what the amounts are?

Mr. OVERTON. I should have to get the conference report to give the Senator that information.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it is worth while knowing. There are a number of persons on the receiving end of this proposition, and the way it is being administered in the District of Columbia is a national disgrace.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May we have that portion of the conference report read?

Mr. OVERTON. I will give the information to the Senator.

The provision as agreed to in the conference is as follows:

In expending appropriations contained in this act under the caption "Public assistance," not more than the following monthly amounts shall be paid therefrom: Emergency Relief of Residents: Single persons, not more than \$24; family of 2 persons, not more than \$30; and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age, not more than \$6; and not to exceed a total of \$60 to any one family; Home Care for Dependent Children: Family of 2 persons, not more than \$30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age, not more than \$6; and not to exceed a total of \$60 to any one family; Assistance Against Old Age Want, and Aid for Needy Blind Persons: Not more than \$30 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is it not a fact that the provision of law—perhaps in this conference report, I am not sure; perhaps by some other provision—is to the effect that surplus commodity provisions may not be granted to persons who have the sort of assistance now provided by this report?

Mr. OVERTON. That is not my understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the Senator is of opinion that the conference report does not shut out the beneficiaries of this assistance from the distribution of surplus commodities?

Mr. OVERTON. No; my understanding is that it does not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has the Senator before him the provision of the bill itself, as it passed the Senate, which was altered by this arrangement?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator means as to the limitation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What did the bill as passed by the Senate provide?

Mr. OVERTON. The House had provided a limitation of \$48 to any one family. The Senate had provided as a ceiling that not to exceed \$48 per month in the aggregate should be paid to any one family of five or less persons from appropriations contained in the act under the caption "Public Assistance," and not to exceed \$6 per month to each beneficiary in excess of such number. Consequently, the House had a ceiling of \$48 on any one family. The Senate amendment provided for a ceiling of \$48 on any one family of five persons or less, and not to exceed \$6 for each additional person, with a ceiling of \$60 in all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is paid to aged persons under the present law?

Mr. OVERTON. Under the present law the average is \$26.52 per month.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the maximum? If the average is \$26.52, it is probably true that the maximum is more than the \$30 which is the maximum limit now provided by the conference report.

Mr. OVERTON. The average is what is usually paid out; but occasionally some of the old persons need a new set of false teeth, and an additional allocation will be made for that purpose, and that brings up the allowance for that particular month or particular time. There are not more than two or three grants in the District of Columbia in excess of \$48.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe there would be any opportunity of revising the report in this particular if the bill went back to conference?

Mr. OVERTON. We had quite a long discussion about it, and finally we came to the agreement which is now represented in the conference report. We spent some time in discussing it, and this was the best formula we could evolve after thorough consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe it would be useless to attempt to send the bill back to conference?

Mr. OVERTON. I think so, on this particular item. There are some items on which I hope we can reach an agreement. There are three main items on which we are still in disagreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the conferees are in disagreement on some items, and therefore the bill must go back to conference, why would it not be a good plan also to take this item back to conference?

Mr. OVERTON. Before we finally agreed on the formula to which I have referred, and which I read just a moment ago, we called into consultation some of those in charge of the relief agencies, and also the Commissioners, and it was their view, as I understand, that this formula would work out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, numerous representations have been made to me with respect to this provision of the conference report, and it is alleged that it will work a hardship on needy, aged persons in the District of Columbia. As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, the administration of public assistance in the District is not a credit to the Federal Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not wish to be understood as referring to the technical administration. What I meant was that Congress, by fixing these arbitrary ceilings without regard to the size of a family, has produced a situation which, in the Nation's Capital, is a national disgrace.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Senator to mean exactly that, that the responsibility for lack of proper care lies at the door of Congress and not at the door of those who are charged with the technical administration of the provision.

Inasmuch as it will be necessary to take the bill back to conference, I ask the Senator if he will not agree that this provision shall also be taken back to conference. I should like to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. OVERTON. We had better take all the items on relief back, if we take anything, because this formula applies to all the items with respect to public assistance. We fought very strongly to get an increase. In the Senate we inserted an increase in the bill of \$600,000 for relief, and the House would not yield. They are not willing to increase the amount over the \$900,000 provided, and we are still in disagreement on that provision.

The Senate undertook to increase the appropriation for old-age relief, and the House would not yield. Finally the Senate conferees yielded on the increase.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the point. I feel that the Senator did a good day's work.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me interrupt to say that we have worked for many days.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I mean when this provision with respect to old-age assistance was adopted. I am hopeful, therefore, that inasmuch as the whole item in disagreement must go back, the Senator will agree to take back also the provision I have been discussing, particularly in order that some of us who are very much interested in it may have the opportunity of learning exactly what the facts are.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator will agree to my suggestion, and I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. What would be the proper motion to make in order to eliminate this particular item from the motion of the Senator to agree to a portion of the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the conference report cannot be amended; that the only way to correct it would be to disagree to the entire report, which would send it back to conference again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the whole report be sent back to conference.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I trust the motion will not prevail. We have spent hours and hours and days on the report. There were 137 items in dispute, and we have come to an agreement on the overwhelming majority of them. Only three issues are now in dispute, and I hope the whole report will not be sent back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that a motion to recommit would not be in order because the House has already agreed to the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any motion which may now be made from the floor of the Senate by which the Senate may insist upon the position it has taken heretofore?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote rejecting the report would send it back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So the question arises merely upon the report. Those who want the report to go back to conference should vote to reject the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amount of the Federal contribution to the District is not involved in the report, is it?

Mr. OVERTON. That is in disagreement.

Mr. MILLER. What is the purpose of the Senator from Louisiana in reference to that? Is he going to ask for a conference?

Mr. OVERTON. I intend to ask for another conference.

Mr. MILLER. Of course submitting the matter to the Senate for a vote as to whether or not we will sustain our former position?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; that is my purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its

action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5610, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 27, 1939.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 21, 34, 50, 57, 58, 117, 129, and 133 to the bill (H. R. 5610) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and at the end thereof, before the period, insert a colon and "Provided, That the foregoing appropriation shall be for payment in full for all services heretofore or hereafter rendered in connection with the study for the revision of the organization of the District of Columbia."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the sum stricken out by said amendment, and following such sum insert a colon and "Provided, That the activities provided for under this appropriation shall be operated under the joint control, supervision, and direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert a colon and "Provided, That such playgrounds shall be kept open for play purposes in accordance with the schedule heretofore maintained for playgrounds while under the jurisdiction of the playground department."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of said amendment insert a comma and "and a report of expenditures for such repairs and improvements to other municipal buildings shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Budget."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "That no appointment shall be made during the fiscal year 1940 in the grade of private until 16 vacancies exist in such grade, and 15 of such vacancies shall not be filled during such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to cause a survey to be made for the purpose of determining what consolidations of present fire department stations can be effected and as a result thereof what, if any, economies may be made in the cost of operating the fire department, and what additional amount would be needed for new construction, a report of such survey to be made and submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session of Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the sum stricken out by said amendment and preceding such sum insert "and including an administrative assistant at \$4,000 per annum, to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end thereof insert a comma and "except that a permanent type of platform may be constructed from appropriations contained in this act for street improvements when such work is undertaken in connection with roadway paving, repaving or resurfacing, and plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic: *Provided further*, That the street railway company shall pay the cost of maintenance, marking, and lighting after construction."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 101 to said bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 39, 41, 55, 75, 122, and 127.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 1, 59 to 71, inclusive, and 101, and ask for a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Before the motion is acted upon I wish to say that the amendments in disagreement are, first, the amendment in reference to the Federal payment. The House placed the Federal payment at \$5,000,000, the Senate at \$7,750,000. The second is the amendment in reference to school-building con-

struction and consolidation. The third amendment is in reference to the public-assistance provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair]. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BURKE, Mr. KING, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3325) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. REED of Illinois, Mr. LARRABEE, and Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6577) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland, and Mr. BATES of Massachusetts were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 142 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 141 and 158 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House further insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1302. An act to continue in effect until June 30, 1942, the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935, as amended;

S. 1805. An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens;

H. R. 5427. An act making appropriations for the Labor Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6392. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

WORK-RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in the matter of the order of procedure, the Senator from Florida has asked that we take up some amendments ahead of those immediately pending. I request that we take up the public-works amendment, which will give time for the Senator to conclude his address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate now recur to the amendment on page 35? The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to strike out and insert.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	King	Reynolds
Andrews	Ellender	La Follette	Russell
Ashurst	Frazier	Lee	Schwellenbach
Austin	George	Lodge	Shipstead
Bailey	Gerry	Lucas	Slattery
Bankhead	Gibson	McCarran	Smathers
Barkley	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Bilbo	Glass	Maloney	Taft
Bone	Green	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Guffey	Miller	Tobey
Bridges	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Capper	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Connally	Holt	Pittman	White
Danaher	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Donahay	Johnson, Colo.		

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is a vote about to be taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. An endeavor is being made to develop a quorum of the Senate.

Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I wish to make only a very short statement with reference to the position of the Senate committee. The President of the United States did not submit to the Congress any Budget estimates for an appropriation for P. W. A. With his knowledge of the unemployment situation and of the possibilities of furnishing additional jobs through making appropriation, after taking the whole situation into consideration, he did not ask of the Congress that it appropriate any money for Public Works Administration. The House of Representatives provided that of the total amount asked for W. P. A. there should be diverted to P. W. A. \$125,000,000. The President has opposed that diversion. The Senate committee thought he was right and struck from the joint resolution, first, the provision diverting \$125,000,000 to P. W. A. This the President has announced publicly would mean giving jobs to 165,000 more people through the agency of W. P. A.

The pending amendment seeks to add to the Budget estimate \$400,000,000 to carry on P. W. A. The money that has heretofore been appropriated for P. W. A. is still available. It was said 2 months ago that the peak of employment under P. W. A. would not be reached until October. Certainly for months thereafter there will be employment furnished as a result of the appropriation last year of \$900,000,000.

The question is whether or not the Congress shall, without regard to the Budget, add \$400,000,000 additional at this time for the purpose of carrying on the program of P. W. A.

The Senate committee was of the opinion that the time had come for the Congress to say what should be done with reference to P. W. A. By the action taken by the committee the Works Progress Administration will have more money, by the action taken by the Senate on the amendment that

I introduced certainly more material will be made available, and when more material is made available by the sponsor, more jobs should be available.

In determining whether or not we should add \$400,000,000, I wish the Senate to take into consideration the request of the President submitted within the last 2 weeks. In a letter the President said that he believed the time had come for the Congress and the Government to make loans instead of gifts to the States, counties, and municipalities seeking public improvements. He urged that the Congress authorize the lending of as much as \$870,000,000 to the States, counties, and cities for various purposes.

One of the purposes is that a loan made by the Government should be to take care of the projects which have been approved by P. W. A. and which are listed in the document with which Members of the Senate are familiar, including projects amounting in all to one and a half billion dollars. Those projects include all kinds of municipal improvements, such as waterworks, sewerage, incinerators, and every imaginable thing for which municipalities expend money. It is the purpose, if the Congress passes the bill which I understand is to be introduced by the Senator from Kentucky, that the rate of interest should not exceed 2 percent.

The making of a loan at 2 percent or less over a period of years is equivalent to a grant of approximately 12½ to 15 percent. The loans now made by W. P. A. are made on the basis of 4 percent, and the difference in interest over a period of years would mean a grant of from 12 to 15 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amount of the grant in effect by a reduced rate of interest would depend upon the length of time covered by the loan.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is entirely possible that in many cases it would figure out between 15 and 20 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. It would depend upon the period of the loan. However, there is this great difference, which appeals to me: The question is whether or not we shall say to the people of the country that from this day on we are engaged in a permanent program, and that we shall give 45 percent of the cost of municipal improvements through a P. W. A. program; or, on the other hand, that by lending the credit of the Government we shall lend money to the State of Kansas, or to the State of South Carolina, and say to the States, "When we lend you the money we will accept your securities for its repayment. You will then not be looking for something from the Christmas tree, but will be pledging yourselves to repay to the Government the amount of money borrowed from the Federal Government."

I think that point is all-important. It is the most significant change effected by the committee. The question is whether hereafter we shall indulge in gifts or whether we shall merely lend money and cause the local governments of the country to realize that they must pay back what they borrow.

If \$500,000,000, and no more, were loaned to the States, counties, and municipalities by P. W. A. or by the new lending agency, when the securities of the local governments came into the possession of the Government, the head of the lending agency could do what he has heretofore been doing. He could sell those securities and place the money in the Treasury. Only last week or the week before the securities given by the State of California to cover the cost of the Oakland Bridge were disposed of by Mr. Jones at a net profit to the Government. That is a business transaction. The question is whether we shall follow the course suggested by the President or whether we shall determine that from now on we shall continue a gift program which will make every local government look to the Federal Government for one-half the cost of its local improvements.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I infer from what the Senator said that the committee, in making its recommendation, believed it was

carrying out the intent and purpose and policy of the President in this matter.

Mr. BYRNES. Absolutely.

Mr. WALSH. How does the Senator explain the Secretary of the Interior taking another position, as he was quoted as having done by one of the Senators on the floor of the Senate earlier in the day?

Mr. BYRNES. I am very glad the Senator asked me that question. The Secretary of the Interior took that position before the President submitted his views to the Congress and to the country. The President believes that we should have a lending program instead of a gift program.

Mr. WALSH. Many other Senators besides myself feel that if the relief program is generally too complicated and involved, and too difficult for individual Senators to know all the ramifications, we should follow the President in his requests and suggestions of the needs of the country and give him considerable latitude in determining how and where the money shall be spent. I wish to ask the Senator again if in his opinion the action of his committee meets with the approval and favor of the President?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I say "yes" as emphatically as I can say it.

Mr. WALSH. The only reason I pressed the question was not that I doubted the answer, but that only this morning a Senator quoted the Secretary of the Interior as though the quotation were a recent expression on the part of the Secretary.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Arizona was absolutely justified. My friend from Arizona never makes a statement which is not justified. The Secretary of the Interior made the statement referred to to the committee several days before the Chief Executive took the position he did. In my experience I have never quoted anything the Chief Executive has said about any matter. However, in this matter he saw fit to express his views in writing. His views were expressed solely because of my request, I having the same desire as has the Senator from Massachusetts to know the attitude of the President as to this program for the future, in view of the fact that no estimate had been submitted by the administration to the Congress asking for any money.

The statement has been publicly made that so far as the administration is concerned it is not asking for funds for a P. W. A. program. That fact, of course, is not controlling. The Congress may do whatever it pleases about the matter, without regard to the views of the Chief Executive.

I submit to the Senate that the time has come for us to determine whether or not we shall permanently embark upon the program of giving 45 percent of the cost of projects to municipalities.

I admit that there is always something to the suggestions of the Senator from Arizona. The thing which impressed him and actuated him in his attitude, as I gathered in the committee, is that he believes there should be a tapering off in public expenditures. I agree. However, in this case the President asked for the total amount for W. P. A. We know that regardless of the views of men as to the administration, W. P. A. does furnish more jobs than P. W. A. to men on the scene of the job. It can take quick action in relieving unemployment. According to the President 165,000 more jobs would be provided by the action of the committee.

On the other hand, it is said that while P. W. A. does not furnish as many jobs on the project, because it involves contract work and more machinery is used, it does furnish jobs back in the factories. That may be true, but there is one difficulty. Any program of that character cannot get under way for more than 5 or 6 months. If we wish to relieve a condition which now exists, we can relieve it by an appropriation for W. P. A. In addition, we know that only a comparatively small percentage of the total amount available under the P. W. A. program has been spent, and from this day on the amount of money actually going out of the Treasury on account of P. W. A. work will increase until October, when it will reach its peak. It will then gradually be re-

duced. Under W. P. A. we can furnish a sufficient amount of money to take care of unemployment, in the opinion of those who are immediately charged with responsibility for its administration.

I hope the Senate will not, without any Budget estimate, and without any request from those whose responsibility it is in the executive department—not only without any request but with positive opposition to the proposal—add \$400,000,000 over and above the Budget by adopting this amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in the first place I disclaim the statement which was made that my amendment involves a gift program. In reality it is a participation program, in which we ask the Federal Government to put up \$400,000,000. We likewise ask the participating governments to match that sum by putting up their share, which would be 45 percent of the cost of each of the projects approved by P. W. A. In other words, Mr. President, we are asking the Federal Government to join in a cooperative effort with all the subdivisions of government in the prosecution of a works program involving \$1,000,000,000.

Another matter which I desire to develop, Mr. President, is the fact that the Secretary of the Interior has not changed his views. It is my understanding that he presented his views at the solicitation or invitation of the committee. His views are identical with the recommendations contained in my amendment, which is now before the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. While the Senator was absent from the Chamber a few minutes ago the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] stated, in reply to a direct question from me, that it was his opinion that the views of the Secretary of the Interior to which reference has been made were views entertained by him prior to the message sent to the Congress by the President. The Senator led me, and, I think, others, to believe that the Secretary of the Interior does not now entertain those views.

Mr. BYRNES. If I did that, I would not want to do so. I have not talked to the Secretary of the Interior, but when the Senator asked what was the explanation, I answered specifically that it was a fact that the Secretary of the Interior testified before the President submitted his proposals to the Secretary of the Interior. I wanted it known that he made that statement.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps I derived an incorrect impression, but what are some of us going to do when we receive from the head of the Nation a recommendation in relation to relief of one character and receive from the head of a department another directly opposite view as to what should be the policy of the Congress? It is confusing.

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator will permit me, I would say that I have never known the head of a department who was very efficient who was not also very enthusiastic about the particular work entrusted to him. I can understand that situation. But the President of the United States is charged with the duty of considering and appraising the value of all projects, and after considering the views of the Secretary of the Interior, with which certainly he was familiar, he submitted his views as the President to the Congress.

Mr. WALSH. To a degree, a member of the Cabinet is an agent of the Chief Executive, and may have all the enthusiasm in the world for his work and for spending money, but it seems to me it is a primary obligation of loyalty when it comes to spending \$400,000,000 that he should follow the judgment of the Chief Executive.

Mr. BYRNES. I am not going to dispute that, but I do not know that the Secretary of the Interior has not now changed his position. I have no information about it. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President—

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I may explain to the Senator from Massachusetts, the situation is that the Committee on Appropriations called the Secretary of the Interior before it and

asked him what, in his opinion, should be done. I quote his own words:

I am not speaking for the administration. I think we ought to have \$500,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 should be for Federal projects.

That statement was made 2 days before the President sent his message to the Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Has he made any statement since that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. The only information I have, while not directly from him, is that he is still of the same opinion.

Mr. WALSH. Of course that statement seems to me to amount to saying, "It is my wish; I can spend this money if you give it to me and it is desirable."

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out one other consideration to the Senator which may influence his opinion in this matter; in either provision, the one the President has recommended or the other, after all it depends upon his discretion as to how many projects shall be adopted or whether any projects shall be adopted. That is an executive matter. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York provides exactly the same discretion. Not a single project ever has been approved under the Public Works Administration unless the President himself has approved it. If he desires, we give him a choice. In this case he can follow either rule, but he is not compelled to follow either one of them.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Senator agree that the policy the President has proposed to the Congress in his recent message is diametrically opposed to the continuation of P. W. A.?

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, I think that the two are entirely supplementary. I argued to the Senate this morning that I thought there should be a cushion between the two, because we do not know when the new program will get under way. The pending amendment would allow something to be assured in the meantime.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator think that any municipality would abandon the opportunity of obtaining a substantial percentage in the way of a gift for a public building for the sake of a loan bearing, say, 2 percent interest?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from South Carolina explained very clearly that the applications under any plan we may adopt will always be much greater than the amount of money available. There are today on file, I dare say, applications for a billion dollars' worth of work. If we appropriated half a billion dollars, they could do half of it; if we appropriated less than that, they could do less. The Senator from South Carolina pointed out that where they cannot get it from one source that a new avenue will be opened, and that all the preliminary work, such as investigating projects, will have been done, and they will be in shape to go ahead. I think that is an entirely sound conclusion.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator for the explanation, but the Senator from South Carolina has with emphasis undertaken to state that, in his opinion, the recommendation of the committee is the President's wish and desire.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no desire to dispute that.

Mr. WALSH. The problem of relief is so involved, I repeat, and so complicated and so extensive, that I and other Senators cannot give the time to study every detail of it and determine how the money should be spent. In the first place, I place the responsibility in the President of the United States above all others. He has the whole picture before him; he has the various relief agencies working under him, and when he asks for relief purposes a certain sum of money, I propose to vote it to him unless there is some sound reason why I should not do so. I do not propose, however, to provide him more than the amount for which he has asked. So if he does not want this money, if he does not desire the money, and prefers another method, I feel obligated to follow that method.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest, as a matter of history, that twice before the President made no recommendation with respect to public works, and 2 years ago as the bill came over from the other House it contained no provision for public works. The Senate, in considering the problem,

established a public-works program without a Budget estimate, without any recommendation of the President, and without any action by the other House.

Mr. WALSH. That is very interesting. Apparently the President was not very strenuous in his objection. I take the position that there is only one human being who can pursue effective leadership in establishing a policy of economy or who can control in the last analysis the expenditures of the Government. In a municipality it is the mayor; in a State it is the Governor; in the Federal Government it is the President of the United States; and whenever he voices—being able to command to an extensive degree the public opinion of the country, to register his veto—any protest against extravagance or waste or excessive appropriations, he will have the support of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Massachusetts, having been a great mayor, a great Governor—and some day he may be a great President—I can understand his point of view; but there are legislative bodies in cities, there are legislative bodies in States, and we have a legislative body here that is a part of the Government.

Mr. WALSH. The compliment of the Senator is appreciated, and I would be very happy to accept the nomination, if I had any ambitions to hold that most burdensome office, which commands almost superhuman qualities from its occupant.

Let me say to the Senator that I have been in public life for 25 years, and I know that in my State of Massachusetts the one man who can largely control the finances of the State is the Governor of the State. The legislature may protest now and then, but the Governor has the power of veto; he is the voice of the people, especially the taxpayers, at this time of excessive taxes. We may say all we want about extravagance and waste on the part of Congress, and about Congress spending too much money, but, in the last analysis—and I do not say this in criticism, as I hope my Republican friends will note when they undertake their campaign—the responsibility is on the Chief Executive, and, if not almost unanimously, then to a very large degree, the people will follow him, as I am now following him, on matters of relief expenditures.

I wish to say that in this relief measure I cannot determine for myself what limitations should be put upon the expenditure of relief money. The President has his agents, he has his employees, he has officials in the departments who are studying the relief question, who know the figures, who know the situation in my State, and in Arizona, and in South Carolina, and in California. Relief is such a human factor, and it is so important and essential that one official, elected by the people, namely the Chief Executive, has control of it, that I want, so far as possible, to follow him in his recommendations; and I regret to see any conflict between a Cabinet officer and the President on the subject.

I thank the Senator from New York for indulging me to such an extent.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. It is true, as the Senator from Arizona pointed out, that if the Congress adopted an amendment providing \$400,000,000 for grants, after all, the allotments would have to be approved by the President, and he could reject them all. But, Mr. President, I do not think the Congress wants to do that, because, as has been said, there are a billion and a half dollars worth of applications, and I believe the Congress would not care to say, "We are going to approve these projects so that we can say at home, 'The President does not want this plan; he is opposed to it, but we will approve it'; and the projects will be submitted to the President and he can disapprove." Daily the President could be disapproving projects if the Congress wanted to take that position. But our responsibility, first, must be to determine whether or not when the Chief Executive, charged with this responsibility, says the time has come to abandon making gifts of 45 percent for projects, the Congress shall say, "We are going to adopt legis-

lation to force you to make grants; we are going to put it up to you, and, holding the views that you announce in advance, you will have to disapprove each individual project." I do not think the Congress would want to do that.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, of course, I appreciate the very favorable attitude that has been shown in support of the responsibilities, the leadership, and the recommendations of the President. To a very large degree I agree with the philosophy which has just been enunciated on the Senate floor.

Of course, talking about financial leadership and responsibility being placed in the Chief Executive is one thing, and the prerogatives of the legislative body, as indicated in the attitude of the Senate during the last few days with regard to the financial recommendations of the President, is another matter.

The attitude of the Senate with regard to farm parity appropriations is an indication of the assumption of responsibility to a great degree by the legislator. It is true that we look to the President and to the agencies of government under the executive department for guidance in matters of this character; but I do not believe there is a conflict of any major degree between the President of the United States, the suggestions made to the committee by the Secretary of the Interior, and the recommendations contained in the amendment now before the Senate.

The President of the United States, in a letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], proposed a new plan whereby the Government intends eventually to take up the slack and make its contribution to the reemployment of our unemployed. Neither the President nor anyone else intimated that that program could be made effective on July 1. Everybody recognizes the fact that the peak of P. W. A.'s activity will be reached this month, and that it will rapidly and progressively be reduced until July of next year, when there will be only \$9,000,000 left, and 500,000 tradesmen and mechanics and workers will be laid off. Everybody recognizes the fact that to conform with the recommendations contained in the letter directed by the President to the Senator from South Carolina it will be necessary for these projects to be, to a degree, self-liquidating. Everybody recognizes the fact that no doubt the Secretary of the Interior had that fact in mind, and had in mind the category of projects that would fit in that scheme; and he also had in mind, when he appeared before the committee, the fact that there are 5,000 projects pending now, at this minute, before the Public Works Administration, many of which could not under any circumstances or by any stretch of the imagination come within the purview of the new agency when it is set up. Not only are 5,000 projects pending, but projects to the extent of \$1,600,000,000 are already perfected and awaiting action by the Public Works Administration. The Secretary of the Interior, recognizing the fact that this great reservoir of projects could not be considered under the restrictions and limitations of the new program outlined by the President to the Senator from South Carolina, in order that we might continue this program and select projects that could not conform, in his statement to the committee said that at least \$400,000,000 could be allocated at this time for projects in which the Government has a right to participate under the terms of the present P. W. A. program.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New York whether or not the situation in his State is in any way similar to the situation in my State. Last fall, after the appropriation of last year was made, representatives from the Public Works Administration visited various communities in the State, met with committees in those communities, outlined to them the program of the Public Works Administration, and discussed with them possible projects which might be presented by the communities. They actually induced the communities to expend money in the form of engineering expense, architectural expense, or, in many instances, in the form of calling special

elections in order to make it possible to issue bonds for the other 55 percent. A very large percentage of those approved projects, which were really instigated by the Public Works Administration, on which considerable sums of money were spent by the communities, are now standing, and the communities simply have spent the money, and so far as the communities are concerned that money is wasted.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am very glad my distinguished colleague from Washington has developed that point, because, to my knowledge, a great number of the projects contained in this vast list rest in the category he has just described. There are a great many projects which are not only urgent and needed and pressing, but projects which we are to a degree morally, if not legally, bound to consider. There are projects all over the United States in which bond elections have already been held, engineering expenses and costs have already been paid, and in a number of cases contracts contingent upon further action by the Federal Government have already been let. These projects, I believe, come within the category outlined by my distinguished colleague. No doubt the Secretary of the Interior had in mind that minimum program when he appeared before the committee only a few days ago and told them that we were at least in a position to make progress on 25 percent of the vast reservoir of projects, and to leave the other 75 percent for the development of the new agency outlined by the President.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is proper or fitting, or economically justifiable, for the Senate abruptly to end this program at this time. I recognize the fact that it will take time and legislative effort on our part to perfect the new program outlined by the President of the United States. I believe in that program. In my judgment, it is economically sound, and there are many good reasons why it ought to be expedited. I can see, however, how wise and prudent it will be for the Senate of the United States, recognizing the fact that we have this large volume of projects, and appreciating the fact that municipalities have already gone so far as to let contracts and to adjust their budgets, to agree with the suggestion advanced by the Secretary that it is a minimum program that will allow for a continuation of this vast and most successful venture of the Government to the perfection of a privately constructed works program, and that it will avoid, prevent, and obviate the set-back and the peril that will result if the Senate shall immediately discard this program. It is the continuity of the program that this amendment will permit, so that we shall advance from the present status to the new status outlined by the President in proposing his new agency.

Therefore, recognizing the fact that every city in the United States, that every county in America almost without exception, that surely every State in the Union has projects in this advanced and preferential category, in view of the fact that it is only a small effort in comparison with the large number of projects available, and in view also of the fact that it will permit a logical, reasonable transition from the system now in vogue to that outlined by the President, it occurs to me that the Senate would be legislating in a proper and sensible manner, recognizing the condition the country is in and the need for these projects, and the fact that it is not a gift program but is a participation program, if it should adopt the amendment which is at the desk.

Mr. President, what is the situation?

The House, as we all know, earmarked for P. W. A. projects a sum of W. P. A. money amounting to \$125,000,000. The Secretary of the Interior very properly explained to the Senate committee that this money ought to be turned back to the W. P. A., and the President of the United States indicated that the Senate ought to take action of that character; and, very wisely, the Senate committee returned the amount of money earmarked by the House for the prosecution of the W. P. A. program.

My amendment will not take any of the moneys allocated to the W. P. A. It leaves the W. P. A. the amount of money allocated to it by the Senate committee, requested for

it by the President. It merely sets up a minimum W. P. A. program authorizing the expenditure of \$400,000,000 for public-sponsored projects and \$100,000,000 for wholly Federal projects. It permits of the continuity of the Public Works program until it can fittingly be absorbed in the new program that was recommended by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, it is not only an aid to the municipalities but it will not increase the taxes of the country in the aggregate. Where it levies a burden upon the Federal Government, it relieves a local government of the full amount of that burden.

It creates work opportunities for labor, gives to contractors and professional men an opportunity to participate in the fruits of the program, and enriches the country by the building of permanent, enduring, wealth-producing projects. It will allow the local taxpayers to enjoy a reduction in taxes by reason of the participation of the Federal Government with the local government in this particular program.

At this point I desire to present the following letter favoring my amendment from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 27, 1939.

HON. JAMES M. MEAD,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express the approval of the American Federation of Labor of the amendments which you offered to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

In my opinion, the adoption of the amendments you proposed is urgently necessary in order to meet the economic and social needs of the Nation. The Public Works Administration has rendered excellent service and has provided employment for thousands of building-trades workers and others. Its services should be continued. Such an amount of money as you have provided for in your amendments ought to be made available for the use of the Public Works Administration.

I appeal to the Members of Congress, through you, to give a full measure of support to House Joint Resolution 326, which you have offered.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Senator's amendment make provision for funds to be used to give employment to those on the relief rolls?

Mr. MEAD. Obviously the effect of the operation of my amendment would be to reduce the relief rolls.

Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that elections have been held—bond elections—in support of these programs. Engineering costs have already been appropriated and expended, contracts have been let, and many of these projects are in a classification which would prevent them from participating in the new program which will be launched eventually, and which, when it is launched, will give ample reason to the Senate for a further curtailment, if not for the elimination entirely, of the P. W. A. program.

The P. W. A. program is 6 years old, and for the fifth continuous year building construction, according to Dodge reports, are on the upgrade. This particular industry, shocked as the result of the destructive influences of the depression, is on the way back. That is another reason why this is not the time to suspend this program and to await the coming and development of a program which is not ready at this moment.

Mr. President, the program represented in the amendment which I have at the desk, covering only 25 percent of the entire P. W. A. program, will permit of the orderly development of the new program. It will prevent a drastic let-down in the construction industry; it will continue the upturn, the favorable condition which exists now as a result of P. W. A. in the durable-goods industry.

For these reasons I hope this amendment, which will permit of the development of projects which make contributions to the health, the education, and the safety of our country, will be agreed to and the Administration permitted to carry on until such time as it will no longer be necessary for us to make appropriations in this manner.

Mr. President, it would be inappropriate for the Senate of the United States to turn its back now on the communities of the United States that, with the advice and consent of Federal agencies, perfected and developed and submitted for the approval of the Federal Government this vast program, which now depends upon the action taken by the Senate in connection with the amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have under no circumstances which recommend themselves to me taken issue one with the other. The Secretary of the Interior, recognizing the fact that he was called upon by a Senate committee for information based upon his experience and his knowledge of conditions, recommended this amendment as the minimum effort to be taken by the Senate at this time.

The President of the United States outlined in a communication to the Senator from South Carolina the plan of action which will be taken, perfected, and refined by the Senate of the United States at a later date, which, when in operation, will permit of the drastic reduction of appropriations of this character.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the reduction of the appropriation recommended for the Works Progress Administration. I congratulate the Senate committee, that very wisely restored the \$125,000,000 taken from the W. P. A. by the action of the other body.

I feel that all that is necessary now to make the joint resolution all inclusive, to give opportunity to every agency of the Federal Government which has joined with us in this struggle against unemployment, and opportunity to continue this work, is approval of the amendment I have at the desk.

Subsequent efforts on the part of the Senate and on the part of the Congress in the approval of legislation outlined by the President of the United States may, and I hope will, enable us at some future date to reduce drastically the appropriations contained in the pending joint resolution for all the existing agencies of government; but until that time has come, and in recognition of the comfortable progress we are making, and in consideration of those who are being fully employed on this program, and for the further reason that there are still millions of our people who are looking for work, let us not stop this program in its tracks; let us continue it in this modest, moderate manner, so that we will not deny to the municipalities, to the communities, to the counties, and to the States, which are looking to us for positive action today, that justice which their cooperation in the past in the perfection of these projects, it seems to me is their just due. Let us not make the mistake of throwing out of work some 500,000 tradesmen and artisans now gainfully employed in the prosecution of this program. Let us not bring about hardship to the contractors, the materialmen, the technicians, and the professional men who have found opportunity for employment as the result of this venture of the Government into this most successful private construction program.

Mr. President, I say that in consideration of all the facts and all the circumstances this amendment should receive Senate approval at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimously consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an article by myself entitled "The P. W. A. in New York State."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

THE P. W. A. IN NEW YORK STATE
(By Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York)

There are now pending before the Public Works Administration applications from municipalities in the State of New York for 429 projects with an estimated total cost of slightly more than \$257,000,000. Cities and towns in almost every county in

the State have drawn up plans for permanent and useful public works, and are only awaiting P. W. A. assistance before undertaking this necessary construction.

I am not saying that every single one of these projects is imminently essential to the welfare of the people of my State. There are a few that could possibly be undertaken with funds other than those of P. W. A.; there are a few others that could possibly wait over a year or 2 years; but, after eliminating all these, about 85 percent of all the pending applications are in need of immediate aid if these worth-while works are to be undertaken at all and if thousands of families whose heads work in the construction trades are to remain off the relief rolls.

On the basis of a \$125,000,000 appropriation the State of New York could hope to undertake the construction of no more than 5 percent of the projects for which it has applications pending. While this amount would be very helpful, by no means could it be considered sufficient to take care of even a decent proportion of the great need. To take up any reasonable amount of the slack in employment that will be created when the public works now under construction begin to taper off, the Congress must provide a minimum of \$400,000,000 to take care of the most worth while of the non-Federal applications pending. Unless such a provision is made there will be under construction on July 1 of next year only \$9,000,000 worth of public-works projects. About one-half million men now engaged in the construction of public works financed by P. W. A. will have to look elsewhere for their sustenance. We can provide for them through normal employment on P. W. A. projects or add them to the relief rolls—that is our choice.

P. W. A. projects have the endorsement of communities in almost every county in the United States. In the last P. W. A. program more than 6,000 projects were submitted to voters who were asked to pass on bond issues. About 82 percent of these propositions were approved.

Let me point out the nature of these works for which communities in my State of New York have applied to P. W. A. Applications for school projects lead the list. There are 129 of them. New York State has made great strides in the last several years in modernizing its school curriculum and in bringing its educational facilities up to date. Centralization of school districts and consolidation of schools has been undertaken on a vast scale, not only because such methods bring the children better and fuller opportunities for broader education but also because the method is economical. This is especially true in the rural districts of up-State New York. And this economical and worth-while advance in the educational system of my State has been made largely in the last few years as a result of P. W. A. aid.

Take the case of the school at Corfu, in Genesee County, just to select one out of the great number of P. W. A. school projects. The old school up there had been in use since about 1880. It was dilapidated, obsolete, and terribly overcrowded. It was staggering under a load of 180 pupils. Many more would have gone to school but there was no room. Many more would have gone to school but there were no laboratories, agricultural shops, or other facilities for vocational training and for modern studies. Finally, the school district made application for a P. W. A. allotment for a school to accommodate 300 pupils to take care of future needs. Here was a worth-while—a socially desirable and useful project of permanent value. P. W. A. made the allotment. The school was completed in December 1936. I have been informed that the very next school term the school was filled to capacity. A lot of children who had been on the streets were attracted by the school and enrolled. School districts in neighboring communities shut down their own schools and permitted the children to go to the new school at Corfu. The enrollment jumped to 400. Centralization of the school districts in the area was carried out, and the new consolidated school district applied to P. W. A. for aid in enlarging the Corfu school, and in addition asked for a new school. The new school is now under construction, and the Corfu school is being remodeled—two wings are being added—to bring the total capacity up to 600.

Other school districts would like to do the same. Overcrowding of schools simply compels the construction of new schools and additions and improvements to many of those that are already serving to capacity.

About 75 of New York's pending applications before P. W. A. are for waterworks projects. To protect the health of their citizens, to serve and attract industrial establishments, and to provide a necessary service for the public, communities in every section of my State need to build storage tanks, filtration plants, or extend their water mains. An adequate supply of good water is obviously so essential to life and welfare that there is no need for me to point out the necessity for such projects. Delay in some instances may actually be dangerous. In other cases it may merely serve to retard local economic prosperity.

Take the case of Webster, N. Y. Webster, in Monroe County, is in the midst of a highly developed agricultural and industrial area. The canning industry is one of the backbones of business life in the farming centers. But a lack of water hampered Webster for years. The town outgrew the well-and-bucket system back in 1910, when some springs were found and developed. But the population outgrew the supply, and the situation often became critical, especially in the summers when the springs dried up. For 10 years water had to be brought in by truck from nearby towns, and in some summers trucking the water cost as high as \$15,000.

Webster had about given up hope, when an application was sent to P. W. A. for assistance, and was acted upon favorably.

The project was undertaken and the new waterworks system was completed in 1937. Shortly thereafter a nationally known packing plant took option on property and began the construction of a packing plant. That meant more pay rolls for the people of Webster. In addition, other plants have become interested, and neighboring towns have connected mains with Webster's water supply, bringing in additional revenue to the town's treasury.

P. W. A. has already assisted communities in New York in the construction of 92 waterworks projects. Many communities unable to partake in the earlier programs are now asking for an opportunity to cooperate with the Federal Government in bringing an adequate supply of good water to their citizens. No one will deny the value or necessity of such projects, all of which give a high degree of employment and nearly all of which cannot be undertaken without Federal aid.

No less important are the sewerage projects, for which many cities in my State are applying. I notice on the list of pending applications one for North Tonawanda. This seems to be one of the many vital projects that can be undertaken. The application is for a sewage-disposal plant. Cities on both sides of this town have already built such plants in an endeavor to abate stream pollution in the Niagara River. The value of millions of dollars' worth of work already undertaken is jeopardized if this one town which is polluting a stream is permitted to continue dumping its sewage untreated in the river. Funds which aid this town would help a whole area.

I could go on and point out community after community which is making an ardent and sincere effort to take care of its sewage problems in accordance with the recommendations of the State department of health, but which is hampered in its efforts by a lack of funds. P. W. A. assistance is vital to protect the health and welfare of the people.

There are also applications pending for hospitals, homes for the aged, fire departments, jails, libraries, and various other public structures which are important to the people of my State, and which during construction will provide millions of man-hours of work not only at the sites of construction alone but also in factories and mills which make the materials, and on truck lines and railroads which transport the supplies.

Most of the projects which have been applied for are to be built in up-State New York, in cities and towns that are anxious to provide decent employment at decent wages for their citizens. A number of the projects are in New York City. Out of the 10 projects for which the city itself has applied, 8 are school projects, while of the remaining 2, one is for a tunnel and the other for a major highway improvement. Overcrowding in the secondary schools of New York City has created a tremendous problem for the board of education. Only through the construction of adequate school facilities can the city meet its obligations to the young people—the future citizens.

In Bronx County five projects are on the pending list, four of which are for public works in New York City. In Kings County five projects are on the pending list, all of which are in New York City and Brooklyn. In Queens County four projects, of which three are in New York City. In Richmond County four are pending, all of which are in New York City. In New York County 12 projects are pending, all of which are in New York City.

All in all, the need for public-works assistance is so great that an appropriation of less than \$400,000,000 for non-Federal projects throughout the Nation would leave many of those now employed on P. W. A. projects jobless, and leave undone the many vital improvements which cities, towns, and counties everywhere need.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret to find myself in disagreement on this proposal with my good friend the Senator from New York.

Heretofore those of us who have been interested in relief and in work programs have labored under the necessity of fighting to get Congress to appropriate as much money as the President asked. Now, by a strange set of circumstances, we are compelled to fight to keep Congress from giving the President more than he asks, for that is what is really involved.

I say without hesitation that the President of the United States is in possession of as much information concerning the details of unemployment and relief, and the need for relief, as is any other man in the United States, and in that statement I am not even willing to except those who are actually in charge of relief work. The President has an amazing amount of detailed information, not only as to the general situation throughout the country, but as to the situation in any State or in any county that is of any consequence where there is unemployment.

I do not believe anyone can gainsay the statement that no man in this country in the last 6 years has displayed a greater interest in the question of unemployment and relief than has the President of the United States, and when he comes forward with a recommendation as to what he wants in the way of money, and what he intends to do with it, and

how he thinks it ought to be expended, I think the burden of proof is on those who dispute his figures and his philosophy, to prove that he is wrong about them, and that he does not know what he is talking about.

The President has not asked for the appropriation now proposed. Not only has he not asked for it but he has said that he does not want it.

I grant that in the letter to the Senator from South Carolina he was talking primarily and specifically about the allocation of \$125,000,000 in the measure as it passed the House for P. W. A., to be taken out of the appropriation for W. P. A. But the President did not satisfy himself with simply saying that he was opposed to that transfer. He went on in detail to outline an entirely new program, not only comprehending non-Federal building projects but comprehending an extension of activities by the Federal Government in many other lines looking toward the resumption of employment among the unemployed of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask this question for information. I have heard it said that the grant of 45 percent, which is given under the P. W. A. program, is in substance the lending of money to those who initiate the projects without interest for the ordinary loan period. Is that about correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would not say it was. I think the 45 percent is an outright grant.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I mean is the 45 percent, with interest on the 55 percent which is made in the form of a loan, about the same as the Government lending the whole amount to the applicant without any interest whatever?

Mr. BARKLEY. It probably might figure out that way approximately. But as a matter of fact the lending of the entire amount necessary to construct a building, at a rate of interest not to exceed 2 percent, depending somewhat on the length of the loan and the amount of interest that would accrue during that length of time, would equal approximately a 15- to 20-percent grant.

Mr. PEPPER. That is, on the basis of a 2-percent interest rate?

Mr. BARKLEY. On the basis of a 2-percent interest rate on the entire amount.

Mr. PEPPER. With a 5-percent interest rate, say, or 4-percent interest rate, it would be equivalent to a grant of about 45 percent?

Mr. BARKLEY. Very likely that approximates the comparison as nearly as it can be made.

Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior has been mentioned, and his testimony before the Senate committee has been referred to. I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Secretary of the Interior. I have confidence in his integrity and his ability. I think he has done a fine job in the administration of the P. W. A. There has never been a suspicion of any sort with which I am familiar that in any way connects the administration of the P. W. A. with any impropriety or with any politics or anything else except sound business administration of the Public Works Administration. I think that is the universal opinion not only in the Senate but outside the Senate Chamber.

The Secretary of the Interior will not be in charge of this work after next Friday. He goes out of business as the Administrator of P. W. A. The President, by his reorganization plan No. 1, has concentrated all public work agencies under a new authority, and he has appointed Mr. John M. Carmody, who has likewise done a fine job as the head of the Rural Electrification Administration, as the Commissioner or Administrator for the consolidated building programs and agencies which are combined by the President.

I do not know what the new Administrator's attitude would be toward \$500,000,000 for P. W. A. I think I know, but I am not authorized to quote him. Neither am I authorized to say what the Secretary of the Interior, who testified before the President recommended his new program, would have said had he testified subsequent to it, or what modifications he would have made in his recommendations

had he testified subsequent to it, or whether he would have made any modifications at all. It may be that he still entertains the view that he entertained on the day he testified.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think I am safe in saying to the Senate that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has not changed his opinion. I can also state to the Senate that Mr. Carmody believes it would be a tragedy for the new administration, of which he becomes the head, to be killed on the 30th day of June.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one wants the new administration of which he is to be the head killed on the 30th day of June. But, inasmuch as the Senator from Arizona has taken the liberty to say how Mr. Carmody feels about it, I will say that I heard Mr. Carmody say that he believed that more money than is provided for even in the amendment of the Senator from New York could be loaned upon self-liquidating projects without any grant whatever. I think he was absolutely sincere about it. He referred to what has happened in the case of self-liquidating projects without any grants whatever. He referred to what had happened in the Rural Electrification Administration, where communities in the rural sections of our country, without a dollar's worth of grants, have borrowed for a long period of time 100 percent of the amount required to install the plants, and are paying rates of interest even higher than the 2 percent required in the present program.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think Mr. Carmody looked at it as I do. Both plans are excellent. It is merely a question of when the new program can be placed in operation. There is no essential conflict between the two.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Arizona says. We always appreciate in every thing and in all ways the sincerity of the Senator from Arizona. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who enjoys more deeply the confidence, as well as the affection, of his colleagues than does the Senator from Arizona. I know I have entertained that feeling, as he has known, for a quarter of a century, and there is no one upon whose judgment I would rely more firmly than on his in nearly everything, and under equal circumstances even in this matter. But I think we are confronted with a different situation than that which we have been confronted with heretofore.

The President in his letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], which I have before me, does not satisfy himself simply with opposing the transfer of \$125,000,000 from the W. P. A. to P. W. A., with which Secretary Ickes agreed, and with which the committee agreed, and with which I agreed. If we are to give the P. W. A. \$125,000,000, or any other amount, it ought not to be taken out of W. P. A. funds, because, as the President said, it involves the employment of 165,000 American citizens who are on relief or who are certified for relief.

The P. W. A. does not employ relief labor. Senators may say whatever they please about it, but the testimony of all the State directors is that, so far as relief labor is concerned, so far as the 750,000 or 850,000 unemployed men who are now on the list and already certified, an appropriation of \$400,000,000 or \$500,000,000 for P. W. A. would not employ them all, or any considerable number of them. It has been shown that even when we undertake to require contractors to employ relief labor, they employ some of it for awhile, and then find some excuse for discharging the relief labor and going back to their regular employees whom they employed in their community.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Is it not true, though, that to the extent that the Public Works Administration provides employment there is a reduction in the reservoir of the unemployed who are on the rolls of the Works Progress Administration, thus relieving the load the Works Progress Administration has to carry?

Mr. BARKLEY. It may relieve the situation slightly, but nothing like the extent to which it should be done. I think

it is true, by and large throughout the country, that the mere fact that a man goes to a certifying agent and becomes certified as being in need raises the presumption that he is more in need of work than someone who does not go to a certifying agent to be certified for employment. It may be, and I think it is, a matter of pride in some instances. Many men do not like to appear before a certifying agent and admit their need. That is probably more true of skilled workers than of unskilled laborers. It may be that they remain off the lists as long as possible. However, in spite of that fact I think that when there are 100 men in a community, and we may assume all of them to be out of work, if 50 of them go to the certifying agent and present their need for employment and 50 do not, we have the right to assume that the 50 who go are in greater need than the 50 who remain away. So far as unemployment is concerned, I am not so certain that if we were to increase the appropriation it would not be wiser to add \$400,000,000 or \$500,000,000 to the W. P. A. than to put four or five hundred million dollars at the disposal of the P. W. A. If the \$125,000,000 which was transferred in the House provision from the W. P. A. to the P. W. A. involves the employment of 165,000 men who are on the unemployment lists and rolls, then \$500,000,000 would employ approximately four times that many, or nearly 700,000 men; and the employment of 700,000 more men who are on the unemployment rolls and have already been certified would almost entirely absorb the 750,000 or 800,000 who are on the waiting list.

So far as the employment of men who are in dire need is concerned, and whose need is presumed to be greater than that of those who have not been certified, giving \$400,000,000 or \$500,000,000 to the W. P. A. rather than to the P. W. A. would result in greater employment among the needy unemployed. I would not vote for such a proposal, because I think the President, in surveying the situation and taking into account the probabilities of needs during the next fiscal year, has asked for all the money he thinks is necessary. I certainly do not wish to assume that I am wiser than the President by forcing upon him money he does not want and does not think he needs.

It is said that the program outlined by the President is tentative and speculative and may not be adopted. That depends upon Congress. The program involved in the President's recommendation in his letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is a long-term program. There are some items in it which may arouse controversy. Already some controversy has been aroused over the proposal to make loans involving the export of our products to foreign countries, conveniently referred to as loans to foreign governments, which is not at all accurate. There may be some controversy as to the practicability of the toll-road and bridge program suggested by the President; but I dare say nobody will seriously oppose the 2-year program of construction of non-Federal buildings and projects with the \$350,000,000 which the President proposes to spend over a 2-year period for the very type of projects involved in the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator inform us when a bill embodying the suggested plan will probably be introduced in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I can assure the Senator that it will be introduced this week. The Senator will recognize the fact that the President made the suggestion only last Wednesday or Thursday. On Friday there was a conference on the matter among various Government officials, including Members of the Senate and House. The bill is now being drafted. If it had not been for the almost continuous obligation to be on the floor of the Senate during the past few days during the consideration of the stabilization bill and of the pending bill, that bill would already have been introduced in the Senate and House.

If I may amplify my reply to the Senator from California, I will say that if it had not been for the exigencies which required us to be in almost continuous session during the whole day and into the night since last Friday, that bill would already have been introduced. I hope it will be introduced not later than Friday. I hope it will be introduced tomorrow. Every effort is being made to get it into shape and to make it as simple as possible, with as few complications as possible, so that it will not involve long delay and discussion.

However, regardless of what anybody may think of any of the rest of the program, that is, the \$100,000,000 for farm tenancy, the \$100,000,000 for rural electrification, and all the other items in the President's recommendation, I have heard no opposition whatever to the proposal to use \$350,000,000 over a period of 2 years for self-liquidating loans to municipalities, counties, and States to carry on the very program outlined in this amendment, at a low rate of interest, so attractive as to induce States, counties, and municipalities to borrow the money and pay it back to the Government of the United States.

In this connection, in all fairness I think we must take into consideration the problem of how long we shall continue to make 45 percent grants or any other grants as gifts to communities, rather than making the proposal sufficiently attractive to induce them to borrow money from the Government, which they can borrow from no other source, placing upon them the obligation of repaying that money to the Treasury and relieving them of the theory that all they have to do is to run to Washington and obtain a gift; that if they can afford to put up, either in bonds or cash, 55 percent, they can obtain from Uncle Sam a gift of the other 45 percent.

We have had to follow such a program. I think our country has made a valuable investment in all the communities where P. W. A. projects have been carried out; but I think the time has come when we must seriously consider putting the facilities of the United States at their disposal in the matter of credit, but not in the matter of grants and gifts. I believe that every dollar we put at the disposal of the President to carry out the program of long-term loans at a low rate of interest will be taken by the municipalities, counties, and even States. As I stated a while ago, the low rate of interest over a period of years amounts to a gift of 15 or 20 percent. However, the loan would carry with it the obligation to repay the money. The plan does not involve any deficit. It does not involve any appropriation. It involves the use of revolving funds and the credit of the Government to take over local obligations under a form of guarantee which will make it unnecessary for Congress to appropriate any money in order to carry out almost the identical program involved in the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the Senator's opinion that many of the P. W. A. projects now pending, some of which would be approved and the money for which would be allocated if this appropriation were to be made, would be built anyway under the lending program rather than the 45-55 percent program?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am absolutely certain of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the Senator has no figures; but, in his opinion, what percentage of the projects now pending would be built under the lending program rather than the old P. W. A. program?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that depends on the amount. It may also depend upon the extent to which any city or county can go in issuing bonds if it has already reached its limitation. That restriction would apply even under this amendment, because it would apply to the part which the local government would have to raise locally as well as to the grant. For example, if the 2-year program of the President were carried out, calling for \$350,000,000 for this purpose, of course, it would not be sufficient to do \$1,000,000,000 worth of work unless the localities, in addition to the amount they borrowed from the Government, put up additional funds, which they could do, and in many cases would do.

Mr. TYDINGS. The reason why I asked the Senator that question is that it has been said—I do not know whether or not the statement is accurate—that there are about one and a half billion dollars' worth of projects pending. Certainly if \$300,000,000 were made available, it strikes me that at least 20 percent of the projects would be built anyway, which would consume the \$300,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that is a pretty fair deduction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly the Senator is correct about that. If the local communities, in addition to borrowing the amount available for the project, desired to add to it by local taxation or by the expenditure of money from current funds, or in any other way, the total amount available would be enlarged, and might even approximate the \$1,000,000,000 which has been mentioned as the probable amount of approved projects for which there has been no money.

Mr. TYDINGS. In any event, 20 percent of the pending projects, it seems to me, would be financed by municipalities and the units forming them, out of the total loans provision, because a great many of them represent pressing needs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt, what would happen to the other 80 percent?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, they would not be constructed.

Mr. TYDINGS. In time they might come in and be constructed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; they might come in, anyway. But if there were a billion dollars for a new program, and they could borrow \$350,000,000, that would be 35 percent to start with; and if they could raise additional funds, the percentage might go from 35 percent to 75 percent. Under the amendment as offered, they could only construct, probably, through grants and loans, 50 percent of the projects that are said to have been approved.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield further to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was going to say we cannot furnish money to build every project, anyway.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that \$400,000,000 under one proposition and \$300,000,000 under the other would more or less level off with the expansion that would come, anyway.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only that, but with reference to the billion dollars, or whatever the amount may be, of projects that have been approved and await action, there will always be a time when there will be a billion dollars or so of such projects, because so long as the door is held open for loans and grants, there is a sort of psychology that takes possession of a community that "while the Government of the United States is granting 45 percent, we will hurry and get ours, get in on the list and have our project approved, and if Congress should thereafter appropriate more money we stand a chance to get our share." So long as we keep P. W. A. open to such applications ready for the time when a billion dollars may be available, approved projects awaiting action on the part of Congress or the Administrator will continue to pile up.

There was a time when the Secretary of the Interior, head of the administration of the P. W. A., told me that he had on his desk \$2,000,000,000 worth of projects that had been approved and had come up to him through all the grades—financial, economic, and engineering—and had been sufficiently investigated. He had on his desk \$2,000,000,000 worth of projects which could have been undertaken if he had had the money with which to carry them out. Of course, it is not to be assumed that he would have approved all those projects involving \$2,000,000,000.

In his letter to the Senator from South Carolina the President goes on to say not only that he does not want \$125,000,000, but he thinks there is a better way to deal with the entire non-Federal work program than doing it through the P. W. A. He gives his reasons for his position. I am not

going to read them. The letter is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I presume it has been read by every Member of the Senate.

It seems to me the part of wisdom and of good business to adopt the suggestion of the President with respect to this new program. There will not be any hiatus to speak of between July 1 and the adoption of the new program, unless the Congress is to blame for it. If there should be any delay in the enactment of that legislation, it will be the fault of the Congress. The President has submitted it to us; it is now under consideration; it is being drafted, and will be introduced in a day or two and referred to the appropriate committee. If there shall be any delay after that, it will be the fault of the Congress. I do not believe there will be any appreciable delay. I expect that by the time the program under the amendment of the Senator from New York could get under way, the proposed legislation will be enacted, and it will certainly, in my judgment, set a new and sound program and one the President recommends as a permanent program. Of course, his suggestions carry over a period of 7 years, but this particular work program is only a 2-year program involving \$350,000,000. I think we can trust the President in this matter; I think we can trust his wisdom, trust his good faith, and trust his interest in the unemployed men and women in this country. It certainly is entitled to a trial. I, therefore, hope the amendment of the Senator from New York will not be adopted, but that the amendment of the Senate committee eliminating the transfer of the \$125,000,000 from W. P. A. to P. W. A. will be agreed to.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, one time there was a visiting preacher who preached in a church of which he was not a member, as he did not live in the community where the church was located. He relied for his pay upon the collection which was taken up. The collection plate came around and he put in a quarter. His little boy was with him. After the service when all the members had gone home, the preacher came out by the vestibule and looked into the collection plate. There was his quarter and nothing else. He picked it up and put it in his pocket. His little boy said, "Daddy, if you had put more in you would have gotten more out." [Laughter.] That is the position we are in relative to this program today. We get out just what we put in.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Had the preacher put more in the collection plate, it would still have been his money; it would not have been added to by anything anybody else put in.

Mr. LEE. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not have been "self-liquidating."

Mr. LEE. That is correct; that is true. No matter whether we vote \$350,000,000 or \$350,000,000 plus \$500,000,000, we do so for the purpose of getting money into the hands of the people who do not have money, for the purpose of setting up Government force pumps that will pump money out into the forks of the creek and out to the grass roots, so that money can go to town in the form of purchasing power and start the wheels of industry and head us back toward real permanent prosperity.

The best evidence concerning any document is the document itself. Discussion has taken place here today which would lead us to believe that the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior are at loggerheads as to relief appropriations. Since the discussion started I obtained a copy of the letter of the President to the Senator from South Carolina and read it. I do not find any such suggestion in it; I do not find any such opposition; I do not find any such disagreement of opinion at all in respect to it. I desire to read a part of that letter to support my belief that the President is not opposed to the Mead amendment. The President is opposed to taking any money from the W. P. A., and that is what he says in the letter. The amendment of the Senator from New York would not take any money from the total of the joint resolution; it would add \$500,000,000 to it; the \$1,735,600,000 would still remain, but if we should adopt the amendment of the Senator from New York, there

would be added \$500,000,000, which would make the total \$2,235,600,000. What the President says in this letter is that he objects to taking \$125,000,000 from the W. P. A.

I desire to read merely a portion of the letter which refers to P. W. A. provisions of the House joint resolution. The President says in this letter:

DEAR SENATOR BYRNES: I have your letter of the 19th in which you ask my position as to the provision of the Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1939, as passed by the House of Representatives (H. Res. 326), which would allot \$125,000,000 to the Public Works Administration for loans and grants for non-Federal public works.

I am opposed to this provision. It means simply that 165,000 men who are badly in need of work will have to be dropped from the Works Progress Administration rolls.

Then he goes on to describe these men and how they depend upon W. P. A. employment, how they have no other means of support.

That indicates to me that the President's only concern was that money which is so badly needed would not be taken from the W. P. A. I cannot see any force in the view expressed by the Senator from Kentucky when he suggested that if we pass this we will be forcing upon the President \$500,000,000 that he does not want. He is in this position—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I will yield in a moment. He must, of course, cut down to the bone. In my opinion, that is what he has done in his recommendation in the first instance; and now if we would be courageous enough to take upon our shoulders some of the responsibility of the relief load in this country and add the sum provided in this amendment I think the President would be very happy over it. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the President was answering specifically the inquiry of the Senator from South Carolina concerning the \$125,000,000 transfer, but if that is all the President had in his mind he could have stopped at the end of the second paragraph of his letter. However, he goes on in the letter, not to recommend any additional fund in this measure for P. W. A. but to suggest that all these projects under his suggestion should be "self-liquidating"—the entire amount of them "self-liquidating"—at a lower rate of interest, and he says that various agencies of the Government have been making a survey of projects of that sort which could be carried on and made "self-liquidating" under the plan of loaning at low rates of interest. There is not a syllable or a sentiment or a suggestion or an intimation in the President's letter that he favors a P. W. A. appropriation, because the whole tenor of the letter is to advocate the new plan.

I can certainly say to the Senator from Oklahoma that if he is undertaking to convince himself that the President does not oppose the Mead amendment, he can find out in very short order by conferring directly with the President on the subject.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have no means of knowing the President's attitude on this particular matter except from this letter, added to the President's general attitude on relief. When I put those two together, I do not find any evidence that the President would be opposed to this amendment appropriating \$500,000,000 additional for the purpose of taking care of unemployment in this country and stimulating business. Simply because the President has not asked for this money does not mean that he does not want it; it only means that he did not want to ask for it.

The Senator from Kentucky has just said that there is no evidence in this letter, not one line or syllable, showing that the President favors any P. W. A. proposal. I will state the matter in the negative: Neither is there a single line or paragraph which indicates that the President is opposed to the Mead amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's argument and logic remind me of the preacher who preached a long sermon one night at a church and at the conclusion asked, "Does this congregation want me to preach here next Sunday night?" Nobody

said anything, and the preacher said, "Silence gives consent. I will preach here next Sunday night." [Laughter.]

Mr. LEE. That is sometimes a very powerful argument. Silence may thunder; and in this case, so far as I am concerned, it seems to do so, because how do I know that the President is opposed to the amendment? I never heard of a P. W. A. program until the President himself launched one. I have not had any word from the President to the effect that he does not seek a continuation of the P. W. A. program. We voted for P. W. A. money. We have had a P. W. A. program; and all at once I am told here by the majority leader that the President is opposed to a continuation of this program, which is intended simply to fill in a gap.

As the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has well argued, this is simply a supplementary program; and the President even asked for a supplementary program in this letter. I will read that sentence. Over toward the end of the letter he says:

To give effect to the program outlined above, some supplementary legislation will be necessary.

And this is the cushion that fills in between the expenditure of the funds now available to P. W. A. and the establishment of the new program which is outlined in the President's letter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose the noun for "facetious" would be "facetiosity." [Laughter.] I admire the facetiosity, as well as the speciosity, which the Senator employs in undertaking to convince us that the President, in that sentence, referred to this particular amendment and this particular fund.

The President was talking about supplementary legislation; not a supplementary appropriation, but supplementary legislation authorizing him to do what he outlined and suggested in this program, not only with respect to non-Federal buildings but with respect to the entire program which he submitted to the Senate, and to the Congress through this letter.

Mr. LEE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wonder if the Senator would object to adding to the Mead amendment a provision to the effect that no alien may be employed out of any of the moneys appropriated.

Mr. LEE. I refer the Senator to the author of the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator consider the fact that this \$500,000,000 appropriation was omitted from the Budget an indication by the President that he is not in favor of our appropriating it?

Mr. LEE. No; I could not take that as conclusive evidence. The President is under hammer and tongs all the time to reduce, reduce, reduce; and he knows at the same time that we have unemployment in the country. I think he would appreciate our sharing that responsibility by voting a program big enough to carry out the ideas that we have advanced; namely, that if employment is given to all of the unemployed, we will have prosperity.

Mr. TAFT. When the Senate adopted the farm-parity payments in excess of the Budget, does the Senator remember that the President immediately criticized the Congress for such action? Is there anything different about this particular appropriation?

Mr. LEE. Well, that is a matter of guess. I did not see that the President criticized the Senate for that action. I did see where he said that we should have courage enough to provide taxes that would raise the funds appropriated in that bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think the President is sufficiently diffident that he is not willing to share the responsibility of asking Congress for what he wants? Has the President, during the past 6 years, shown any hesitation in that regard? Has he all at once become so modest that he is not willing to ask us for what he wants, hoping that we shall force it on him anyway?

Mr. LEE. To all of those questions I answer that I do not know.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Did the Senator read the newspapers of this morning before making that statement?

Mr. LEE. I do not know what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator from Kentucky asked the Senator from Oklahoma if the President generally expressed his opinion on what he wanted. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he read the newspapers this morning?

Mr. LEE. Yes; I read them. The President has not been very faint-hearted about expressing his opinion or taking responsibility, nor has he been lacking in courage in launching this program; but that does not relieve us from any part of our responsibility in this matter.

How much did we appropriate last year for the P. W. A. program? We appropriated nine-hundred-and-sixty-odd million dollars. We have spent, or we will have spent when the time ends, nine-hundred-and-sixty-odd million dollars. If we adopt the Mead amendment, and then pass the program which the President recommends, we will then have only \$350,000,000 for P. W. A., and that is over one hundred million less than we appropriated last year for P. W. A., if we have both of them.

Therefore, I cannot agree with those who believe that it is the intent of the President to shut down all of this program. Of course, if we could start this work right away, we could take up the immediate slack; but, as was pointed out by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYBINGS], if all of the \$350,000,000 were subscribed for it might take care of only 20 percent of the projects already approved that have been applied for. Then what would the other 80 percent of them do? Nothing. They would not be built. The labor would not be employed. The material would not be purchased.

Therefore I cannot see why we should not support this year a program almost as large as that of last year; and even if this amendment is adopted we still will not have appropriated as much for this type of work as we did last year.

Now, let us see, what is the difference? The difference in that one proposal is to appropriate \$500,000,000 and lend 55 percent of it at 4 percent, and the other proposal is to appropriate \$350,000,000 and lend it at 2 percent. In the long run, in my humble opinion, the cost to the Government is not going to be greatly different. There is not going to be a great deal of difference, because, figuring it out over a long period of years, with the 55-percent loan at 4 percent we are not in a greatly different position than if we lend all of the money at 2 percent. There is a slight subsidy in each case.

I have always favored P. W. A. over W. P. A. I grant that P. W. A. does not put to work on the ground so many men visibly, and perhaps not at all, but it puts more men to work farther upstream. We get for the money more in return. We get more permanent improvements. P. W. A. has the approval of the public. The laborers are employed by contract, and the man who hires them can fire them. There is no soldiering on the job, there is no gold-bricking, and there is no unsavory criticism as to the work done by this agency of the Government. As the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] said today, in his State P. W. A. has a clean record. That is true in most of the cases. Therefore, I do not see why we cannot support the Mead amendment, which will leave our total for P. W. A. still less than it was last year, and at the same time support the program which the President outlines in this letter, which is to come later.

I cannot see any conflict at all. It looks to me like a supplementary program. It looks to me like a method of getting into operation the very program the President has

outlined here, one of self-liquidating projects. Under P. W. A. in our State we are building a self-liquidating project, the largest project in the State, and that is a power dam. The cost of the dam will be liquidated over a period of years, or at least partially liquidated, by the returns for electricity. P. W. A. is already building many of these self-liquidating and 'semi-self-liquidating programs. That is something I have always advocated. I think it is sound; and I see no conflict whatever between the Mead amendment and the proposal offered by the President. I see no conflict between the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States in this respect. It simply means, if we add this appropriation, that we share to some extent the President's responsibility in voting enough money to make a real program.

We never have had, since this administration has been in power, enough courage to go far enough to prove our own theory of ending this depression, which is that if all the unemployed are put to work we will have prosperity. If we get buying power in the hands of all the people, prosperity is the result. We have been afraid to go far enough each time; and there has scarcely been a given time, I suppose, when we have not had from 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 persons unemployed in this country.

I was very much in accord when I read in the newspaper the letter that the President wrote to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], in which he outlined a program that looked to me as though it was big enough at least to approach the proposition of taking care of the unemployed in this country. I applauded that program when it came out, and I see no conflict between it and this program or the Mead amendment.

I shall vote for the Mead amendment.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I make an effort to facilitate the consideration of this joint resolution? I wonder if we cannot enter into some agreement about a limitation of debate on this amendment. I do not want to cut off any Senator, but it is apparent that we shall have to make more progress than we have made up to this time if we are to get through with the joint resolution tonight. I wonder if the Senator from Florida would be willing to consider a limitation of debate on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have nothing to do with it, except in my own case, and I expect to speak for only about 10 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD and ask to have printed page 1 of Senate Document No. 25, which itemizes the projects which have already been approved by the P. W. A. in the several States of the country, and indicates the amount of the loan and the grant which would be required for each State if those projects were approved and actually put under construction.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENDING NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

Summary of list, by counties, of applications for projects pending before the Public Works Administration which might be eligible for allotment if additional appropriation were provided as of January 18, 1939. Primarily, eligibility would be governed by terms of such appropriation act.

State	Number of projects	Loan	Grant	Total	Estimated cost
Alabama	47	\$421,500	\$2,537,328	\$2,958,828	\$5,639,114
Arizona	91	8,627,500	10,764,093	19,391,593	23,921,483
Arkansas	25	618,000	705,478	1,324,478	1,569,955
California	458	7,814,000	94,045,671	101,859,671	247,201,155
Colorado	42	324,000	2,843,486	3,167,486	6,319,197
Connecticut	91	31,000	10,650,990	10,681,990	23,668,878
Delaware	4		203,292	203,292	451,760
Florida	92	12,997,200	17,157,602	30,154,802	38,128,971
Georgia	91	1,608,875	10,000,453	11,609,328	22,756,023
Idaho	26	179,838	1,743,890	1,923,668	3,875,171

State	Number of projects	Loan	Grant	Total	Estimated cost
Illinois	459	\$292,409	\$39,470,438	\$39,762,847	\$88,173,948
Indiana	61		5,608,698	5,608,698	12,466,027
Iowa	213		8,461,095	8,461,095	18,797,422
Kansas	87	4,637,000	7,007,483	11,644,483	15,595,646
Kentucky	26	275,000	1,426,324	1,701,324	3,169,615
Louisiana	141	1,573,910	15,141,213	16,715,123	33,647,150
Maine	31	28,000	828,828	856,828	1,841,848
Maryland	34	143,000	16,346,630	16,489,630	36,324,846
Massachusetts	49		4,908,144	4,908,144	11,038,929
Michigan	105	982,500	11,650,027	12,632,527	25,883,162
Minnesota	89	23,000	8,844,047	8,867,047	19,653,441
Mississippi	86	2,541,568	3,483,684	6,025,252	7,733,644
Missouri	91	11,000	9,196,642	9,207,642	20,452,626
Montana	41	1,086,200	4,205,766	5,291,966	9,346,148
Nebraska	131	3,209,571	10,625,264	13,834,835	23,611,713
Nevada	20	19,000	1,029,126	1,048,126	2,286,956
New Hampshire	21		1,359,836	1,359,836	3,021,658
New Jersey	187	11,404,000	30,011,254	41,415,254	68,942,480
New Mexico	19	2,295,500	4,496,147	6,791,647	9,991,446
New York	429	18,375,090	114,573,744	132,948,744	257,090,091
North Carolina	81	962,000	4,720,456	5,682,456	10,489,915
North Dakota	53	33,000	2,197,885	2,230,885	4,884,197
Ohio	190	926,500	26,854,233	27,780,733	59,684,163
Oklahoma	54	1,119,000	10,500,092	11,619,092	23,333,926
Oregon	34	175,700	1,400,968	1,576,668	3,113,265
Pennsylvania	966	64,270,300	130,243,047	194,513,347	289,450,945
Rhode Island	12		2,420,483	2,420,483	5,378,850
South Carolina	57	9,554,000	13,138,693	22,692,693	29,197,117
South Dakota	35	43,000	2,746,627	2,789,627	6,099,179
Tennessee	94	4,566,000	9,873,500	14,444,500	21,954,822
Texas	298	33,209,175	59,386,383	92,595,558	134,106,856
Utah	23	195,000	2,293,371	2,488,371	5,096,387
Vermont	15		760,677	760,677	1,690,397
Virginia	150	391,000	9,831,851	10,222,851	21,844,622
Washington	190	447,850	15,091,915	15,539,765	33,537,621
West Virginia	33	1,369,000	7,738,288	9,107,288	17,196,198
Wisconsin	141	8,600,000	17,739,788	26,339,788	39,422,935
Wyoming	41	377,000	2,045,008	2,422,008	4,545,435
District of Columbia	8	8,706,500	7,123,500	15,830,000	15,830,000
Alaska	7	210,000	233,672	443,672	519,272
Hawaii	10		828,225	828,225	1,840,500
Puerto Rico	25	1,689,000	1,484,993	3,173,993	3,299,993
Virgin Islands	3	173,250	176,932	350,182	393,182
Total	5,807	216,535,846	778,163,800	994,699,646	1,775,510,285

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am quite conscious of the fact that I can add nothing of particular note to what has already been said by the able Senators from New York and Oklahoma, except to corroborate the sentiments they have indicated very strongly in favor of the appropriation asked, and in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

I sometimes wonder whether the opponents of the works program are consistent in their attitude. If it is proposed that we have a W. P. A. program, they say that the W. P. A. is an irresponsible agency, that it has had an unsatisfactory record, and that making appropriations to that agency is not the proper way to speed up recovery in this country. Then, if there is proposed a P. W. A. program they have some other excuse for not favoring the proposal. If a loan program is offered, a program based entirely upon the self-liquidating principle, they have some different objection, and probably come back eventually to the conclusion that they actually feel in their hearts that none of those programs should be the policy of the Federal Government.

The only reason why I venture to detain the Senate for even this short length of time is because, in fulfillment of the obligation I owe to my individual conscience, I am never going to miss an opportunity on this floor to offer my humble sentiment to my colleagues that we face frankly, honestly, and candidly the admission of the ugly fact that we are never going to be able to put to work the people of this country who are able to work and want to work, through private enterprise alone in any administration, Democratic, Republican, or anything else.

Within the week an article appeared in the New York Times, written by Mr. Lyon, of the Brookings Institution, and in that article he set out that inevitably, under the organization of our modern-day economy, we have to have work that implements the work which comes from the turning of the wheels of private enterprise. So in one form or another I accept the premise that we have to create work to implement the work that is available in our private economy.

Mr. President, if that premise be admitted, the only thing we have to do is to determine the kind of implemented work, the kind of made jobs, that will be to the public interest.

I do not quarrel with anyone because he prefers W. P. A. over P. W. A., or P. W. A. over W. P. A., or a lending program that is based upon the self-liquidating principle over some other program. I quarrel only with a man who will neither admit the obvious premise nor propose any solution for this challenging problem.

It seems to me, therefore, that the P. W. A. program is perhaps one of those which might meet the rigid conditions of almost anyone who was willing to make new jobs for the people who do not have a chance to work. It has been in operation for several years. Everyone admits that it has been honestly operated. It has been efficiently operated, even in the opinion of its critics, or the critics of the general program.

I have here a list of about a billion dollars' worth of projects which have been subjected to every possible scrutiny of three various examining divisions, and all of them have said these are deserving and meritorious projects. Not only that, but the local people who are the sponsors of those projects are putting up 55 percent of the construction cost and the Federal Government is putting up only 45 percent. That is equivalent in principle to lending them the whole cost of construction of the project, and giving them the interest on it without any charge whatever. So, instead of the lending program to which the Senator from Kentucky referred a few moments ago requiring 2-percent interest, and perhaps giving the recipients some interest, we merely give them all the interest, in substance, upon the money required for the construction program.

I say that it is not an unreasonable thing for the Federal Government to say to any community, "Whatever is for your benefit is for my benefit; whatever is a community asset is a national asset. Therefore, I will match dollar for dollar the money you spend in the construction of useful public works."

The idea that we save money by keeping the obligations of the Federal Government down and pulling the obligations of the local governments up is an obvious fallacy. We have had the experience or proof of it in my own State of Florida. In the real-estate boom days of 1925 and 1926 the various political subdivisions of the State got themselves head over heels in debt. They were very heavily burdened with debt, a higher debt than they could pay. Yet the State government, under constitutional provision, had no debt at all. Were we better off? I say that no State in this Union has as good a taxing system as has the Federal Government, or as adequate a capacity for taxing in a fair way.

Some of the States have principally and primarily the ad valorem tax, which is not a fair method of taxation. That is not a fair measure of ability to pay. Some other States have the sales tax. Nor is that a fair measure of ability to pay. But in those States they sometimes vie with one another to attract residents and to attract capital and attract enterprise. The Federal Government does not have to make a taxation system on that principle. Therefore, I can see no fairer agency that can tax to support a public-works program than the Federal Government.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If the Government lends all of the money at 2 percent it takes 50 years to have the principal paid back. If the Government lends 55 percent of the money at 4 percent it takes 25 years for the principal to be paid back, and at the end of 50 years, under a 4-percent loan, provided the principal were reloaned after it was paid back at the end of the first 25 years, the Government would have back 110 percent of the original amount of the project which lends 55 percent. Therefore, if we are figuring cost over a long period of years the amount of money returned to the Government would be greater under the P. W. A. than under the lending program outlined in the President's letter. The President stated in his letter that he favored

a revolving fund. Therefore, the money which comes in under this proposal would be put in the revolving fund and put out at interest again, no doubt.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. If this policy actually were an absolute experiment, I could understand how there would be a difference of opinion about it, but my colleagues know very well the familiar story of how our economy has reflected the stimulus of a works program and aid by the Federal Government.

I have here an article which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Washington Star this year, and it shows the curve of industrial production in this country, beginning at the bottom at about 58, in July 1932, going up to the top, about 121, in December 1936; then going down to the low mark of 76 in May 1938; then going back up to a little over a hundred in about midsummer 1938, and declining down to 92 in May 1939.

Nearly every one of these rises has been associated with a new spending program of the Federal Government. Nearly every one of the declines has been the inevitable consequence of a program restricting spending by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the least we can do is to give a man in this country a chance to work. There is no possible excuse for any government or any economy where there are able-bodied men and women who need work and who want work; there is no excuse that can be given by a civilized State to such men and women when they cannot find work to do.

I will say to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber that just as certainly as we do not measurably solve the problem of unemployment, we not only will but we ought to be deprived of the instrumentalities of national power. Whether the other party will exhibit leadership to the Nation by solving that problem will, if it gets in power, determine whether it will continue to hold that power. People are not going to perish in a civilized day due to a specialized economy that has outgrown the way of life which makes it possible for private enterprise to give all of them jobs.

I will say to my colleagues that the one way to avoid regimentation, the one way to avoid Nazi and Fascist principles, is through Federal aid to provide private jobs and to provide work, without having to restrict production on the farm or in the factory. If someone prefers the restriction process, let him do so. I am against it. I believe we should have an economy of plenty, as the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has so often and so eloquently urged upon the Senate floor. The only way to get that is to provide purchasing power, and the only thing that offers any hope of that being supplied is this program of the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, we know that people are unemployed. We know they are going to remain unemployed unless we make it possible for them to get jobs. Get away from the W. P. A. if you want to. I should like to see it all abolished and I should like to see such subsidies given to private enterprise that there would be jobs for all under the operations of private industry. But unless such a plan is proposed, and until it is proposed, I shall keep on voting for W. P. A.

I should like to see an adequate lending program, so that every project in America which could be built upon the self-liquidating principle would be able to get capital and the Southwest and the impoverished South would be able to get the capital with which to develop their neglected resources. It ought to be provided, and some day it will be provided, and I shall have the pleasure, I hope, of voting for it when it is offered. But until it is offered and becomes a reality I shall take W. P. A., I shall take P. W. A.; I will take any other alternative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should state again the view of the committee in its report. The committee was not seeking to pass judgment upon the worth of public-works projects. The committee was reporting a relief measure. The committee was confronted, as the Senate is confronted, with the fact that unless relief measures are

passed and signed by midnight on Friday of this week two and a half million people will go out on the streets, off relief, and the W. P. A. will go out of existence.

No such a situation confronts the public-works program. There is no necessity for speed or for including a public-works program in this measure. We can pass a public-works program next week or week after that or later than that. We do not have the emergent relief situation, and I do not think, and the committee, with few exceptions, did not think that the two matters should be confused.

The committee increased the relief expenditures up to the amount the President requested, by taking out the allocation of \$125,000,000 to public-works projects. The committee has followed very closely the recommendation of the President in amount and in purposes. The committee has followed Colonel Harrington's suggestion along that line. I do not believe the Senate should at this time add to the pending measure a public-works section, regardless of the merits of public-works projects. It seems to me that there are a number of things which might be said on the public-works phase of the question. I shall not take time to do so.

Mr. President, I cannot refrain, however, making a comment with respect to one thing that my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], said, because I am one of his admiring and close-listening auditors. He said that if the President would have the courage to spend this much money we ought to have the courage to shoulder the burden and spend another billion dollars. Mr. President, it takes a great deal of courage to spend great sums of money.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. He is an auditor; he audits my books as well as listens to me.

Mr. ADAMS. While I am auditing the Senator's books I will call attention to some statistics. The Senator from Oklahoma said that if the Government were to loan money at 2 percent it would be paid back in 50 years. If it were to loan the money at 4 percent it would be paid back in 25 years. The only fly in that ointment is that 2 percent in 50 years would pay back the principal or the interest, but it would not pay back both the principal and the interest.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from Colorado is criticizing someone else for making a poor argument; he himself is making a poor argument.

Mr. ADAMS. I will admit I am making a poor argument. The Senator does not have to point out that fact.

Mr. FRAZIER. In the measure passed by the House there is a public-works program. The joint resolution will have to go to conference anyway. So it would not entail any additional work. We have in practically every State in the Union projects which have been O. K'd by the Department and they are waiting for the money. The States have been promised the projects, and they are expecting them. I believe they are entitled to them.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, let me say on that point that the Senator from New York made a similar statement—that there was a moral or a legal obligation to those communities that had projects in mind. When the P. W. A. addition was made to the relief measure a year ago—and I was one of those who helped to do it; it was not put on in the House—we provided definitely the amount of money; we provided the dates when the projects could be approved; we made a definite provision in all ways; and no man, no community, no group has a right to claim a promise. That money was all consumed, and they had fair notice and fair warning that if their project, though approved, was not within the amount appropriated, it could not be included. So there is no obligation beyond that.

Mr. President, I know it is important to vote, and I shall discuss this question no further, except to make one additional statement. I made inquiry of the Secretary of the Interior as to the amount of direct labor on the P. W. A. projects on the ground. The direct labor on the P. W. A. projects is 25 percent on the site, and that is not relief labor. What I am thinking of is the man who is hungry, the man who is cold,

the man whose family is in distress. I do not believe that at this time we were making advancement by adding the public works to this relief measure. I am hopeful that it may be kept as a relief measure. Let us meet the public-works program at another time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for a division.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	King	Reynolds
Andrews	Frazier	La Follette	Russell
Ashurst	George	Lee	Schwellenbach
Austin	Gerry	Lodge	Shipstead
Bailey	Gibson	Lucas	Slattery
Bankhead	Gillette	McCarran	Smathers
Barkley	Green	McKellar	Stewart
Bilbo	Guffey	Maloney	Taft
Borah	Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Hale	Miller	Tobey
Bulow	Harrison	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hatch	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hayden	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Herring	Norris	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Nye	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Holman	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Connally	Holt	Pepper	White
Danaher	Hughes	Pittman	
Donahey	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the committee amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to have a word to say about the pending amendment.

It seems to me we are bent upon spending many more millions of dollars. Before the present Congress shall have expired, we probably shall have voted to spend another billion dollars. It is evident to my mind that we have the money to spend; and so long as we have the money to spend we shall continue to spend it.

So long as we have the money to spend, and in view of the fact that we are going to continue to spend money, I am in favor of spending the money in the United States, for the benefit of the 130,000,000 people of the United States and the more than 11,000,000 people who are out of employment at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wonder where the Senator got the idea that we have the money to spend?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Evidently we have it. I obtained the idea through the columns of the press. I learned therefrom that our administration is considering lending \$500,000,000 to the countries to the south of us in South America.

If we have \$500,000,000 to lend to the dictators in South America or Central America, I say let us take the \$500,000,000 and spend it for the benefit of the American laboring men who are out of employment.

For that reason I shall support the Mead amendment, because if we have \$500,000,000 to spend, let us grab the \$500,000,000 and give it to the people of the United States instead of to the dictators to the south.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the committee amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if he were present and voting, he would vote as I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. Being advised that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. HOLT (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] because of illness. On this question he has a special pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I am informed that if the junior Senator from Wyoming were present and voting, he would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that those Senators, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business. These Senators, I am advised, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I am advised that he would vote as I intend to vote on this amendment, and I, therefore, feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following pair:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. If present and voting I am informed the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and that the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily absent on departmental business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. ADAMS. I announce that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has been called out of the city on important matters. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32

Ashurst	Green	Mead	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Murray	Schwellenbach
Borah	Hughes	Neely	Slattery
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Norris	Smathers
Donahay	La Follette	Nye	Stewart
Downey	Lee	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarran	Pepper	Wagner
Frazier	Maloney	Pittman	Wheeler

NAYS—43

Adams	Bridges	Connally	Guffey
Andrews	Bulow	Danaher	Gurney
Austin	Burke	George	Hale
Bailey	Byrd	Gerry	Harrison
Bankhead	Capper	Gibson	Hatch
Barkley	Clark, Mo.	Gillette	Herring

Hill
Holman
Johnson, Calif.
King
Lodge

Lucas
McKellar
Miller
Minton
Radcliffe

Reed
Russell
Taft
Tobey
Townsend

Vandenberg
Van Nuys
Walsh
White

NOT VOTING—21

Barbour
Bone
Brown
Byrnes
Caraway
Chavez

Davis
Glass
Holt
Logan
Lundeen
McNary

Overtton
Schwartz
Sheppard
Shipstead
Smith
Thomas, Utah

Truman
Tydings
Wiley

So Mr. MEAD's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution which I assure the Senate in all substantial particulars is the same as the Mead amendment upon which we have just voted, except that the amount of money is cut in half; that is to say, on page 2 of the amendment the amount for loans and grants is reduced from \$400,000,000 to \$200,000,000. The amount for administrative expenses is cut in half. The amount for Federal projects is cut from \$100,000,000 to \$50,000,000. In addition to that, my amendment provides that the grant shall be 30 percent instead of 45 percent.

Senators will remember that in the original public-works program the grant was 30 percent, and the loan was 70 percent. The proposal I am now making is a 50-percent cut all along the line. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has stated today that under the new program the grant will amount to between 15 and 20 percent. It is now 45 percent. I am proposing, for this interim program, to make the grant 30 percent.

I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. HAYDEN. I assure the Senate that it is the same in all substantial particulars as the Mead amendment, except that in all cases the amount of money is one-half that provided by the Mead amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read, and will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYDEN's amendment was, in lieu of the matter in title II, beginning on page 35, proposed to be stricken out by the committee, to insert the following:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

SECTION 201. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful non-Federal public works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, there is hereby appropriated to the Public Works Administration (herein called the "Administration") in the Federal Works Agency, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$200,000,000, together with the balance of the appropriation made under section 201 of such act of 1938, not reserved for administrative expenses of the Administration and not now or hereafter expended pursuant to allotments heretofore made, which amounts shall be available until June 30, 1941, and may be expended by the Commissioner of Public Works (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner"), subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or other public bodies (herein called "public agencies"), or (2) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

(b) No amount available under this title shall be allotted for any project which, in the determination of the Commissioner, cannot be commenced prior to March 1, 1940, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to July 1, 1941: *Provided*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project involved in litigation in any Federal or State court.

(c) Under the funds available in this title, no grant shall be made in excess of 30 percent of the cost of any project, and no project shall be constructed for lease to any public agency unless the Commissioner shall determine that the nonrecoverable portion of the cost of such project shall not exceed 30 percent of the cost thereof.

(d) No moneys for a non-Federal project shall be paid from the funds made available by this title to any public agency unless and until adequate provision has been made, or in the opinion of

the Commissioner is assured, for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

(e) Not more than \$4,875,000 of the amount available under this title may be used for administrative expenses of the Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, in connection with this title; such amount shall be available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth for such Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940. The Commissioner shall reserve from the amount available under this title an adequate sum for administrative expenses of the Administration in connection with this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

SEC. 202. Moneys realized from the sale of securities acquired by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Public Works Administration, or the proceeds of such securities, may be used by the Commissioner for the making of loans in connection with projects under this title, notwithstanding any previous limitation on the total amount of such securities or proceeds thereof that may be used for loan purposes.

SEC. 203. The Public Works Administration is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on July 1, 1939. On and after the effective date of reorganization plan numbered I transmitted to the Congress by the President of the United States pursuant to the authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1939, all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Public Works Administration, and all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Commissioner of Public Works.

SEC. 204. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, as amended by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. No new applications for loans or grants for non-Federal projects shall be received by the Administration after September 30, 1939: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to applications amendatory of applications for projects received prior to October 1, 1939, and such amendatory applications shall be confined to projects which, in the determination of the Commissioner, can be started and completed within the time limits specified in section 201 (b) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

That portion of section 201 (f) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 which reads "for the completion (except liquidation) of the activities of such Administration," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 205. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until June 30, 1941, the sum of \$50,000,000, to be expended at the direction of the Commissioner, for the making of allotments to Federal agencies for the financing of Federal construction projects (including projects for making surveys and maps) in continental United States outside of the District of Columbia, and the acquisition of land for sites therefor, such projects to be selected from (1) projects authorized by law and (2) projects for the enlargement, extension, or remodeling of existing Federal plants, institutions, or facilities.

(b) No Federal construction project, except flood control and water conservation or utilization projects now under actual construction, shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds made available by this section unless and until moneys sufficient for the completion thereof shall have been irrevocably allocated or appropriated therefor.

SEC. 206. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if I correctly understand that under the amendment as he has now presented it the proportion of public-works cost to be borne by the municipalities, cities, and other public bodies will be 70 percent instead of 55 percent, as under the present plan?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am returning to the original public-works program which we adopted in 1933, when the grant was 30 percent and the loan feature was 70 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand that under the terms of this amendment it would also be perfectly possible for the Public Works Administration to undertake public works without any grant at all?

Mr. HAYDEN. Without any grant at all?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; just by loaning the money necessary for the project.

Mr. HAYDEN. In each case the amount has been a maximum. That is, the law first provided that the grant should not be more than 30 percent. Then the law was amended so as to provide that it should not be more than 45 percent.

The grant might be anywhere from those figures down, of course.

I offer this amendment because the original proposal made by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was submitted in the Committee on Appropriations. It did not prevail. This proposal also was submitted, and it received much more substantial support in the committee, as I hope it will in the Senate.

I think the proposal is thoroughly understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate except to say that this is the same proposition on which we have just voted, except as to the change in the amounts and the relationship between grant and loan.

Personally, I do not see that there is any advantage in the proposal of the Senator from Arizona over the program which we have been talking about today, and which we all hope to have inaugurated within a very short time. So it seems to me there is no advantage to the communities in voting this amendment up, whereas under the program which has been projected and which we have discussed there would be a loan of 15 to 20 percent, but it would be at a lower rate of interest, and all of it would be returned to the Government of the United States, and no grant at all would be involved.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out one advantage to the communities. Under the terms of the House bill, new projects may be considered until next October. The gate is closed now. That will allow the Public Works Agency to consider all these projects; and, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] so ably pointed out earlier in the day, that is a positive advantage in connection with the new plan which the President proposes, because the projects are worked out, and if the money cannot be obtained in one way it can be obtained in another.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it has been demonstrated here beyond cavil that more than a billion dollars' worth of projects are already worked up, and are now ready for action.

Mr. HAYDEN. If they can get 45 percent.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Arizona? If we do not adopt this amendment and appropriate more money, the P. W. A. will fold up. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; it definitely expires 1 year from now. No new projects will be considered, and none could be considered since last October.

Mr. LEE. This \$200,000,000 would not be taken from the W. P. A. appropriation; would it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator I suggest that if the amendment is not adopted, the P. W. A. does not fold up. It still goes on for another year, but it is a new program. The proposal that has been made, if adopted, will constitute practically a permanent law whenever the exigencies require the advance of credit by the Government of the United States to the local communities. So not only would the P. W. A. not fold up, but it would be indefinitely extended.

Mr. LEE. The new program contemplates loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no!

Mr. LEE. The Public Works Administration is wiped out.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the new Work Administration or Authority which is set up in Plan No. I of the President. Its name is changed, but that is all. It still goes on.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona one other question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is going to recognize the Senator from Oklahoma, in order that some Senator may have the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. LEE. I am about to yield to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I wish to ask just one other question. If we should adopt the amendment which the Senator has offered, and should also adopt the new proposed program, we should then have appropriated for W. P. A. only approximately half the amount that we appropriated last year. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I think it ought to be made perfectly clear in the Record that the answer made by the Senator from Arizona to the Senator from Oklahoma may be very misleading. So far as concerns its being true that if this amendment is voted down the P. W. A. will fold up, the records of the Appropriations Committee show that the peak of the P. W. A. work will not be reached until some time in October of this year, and it will not be folding up at all. Those projects are just getting under way; and, as already brought out, at least half of the amount contained in the very large appropriation we made last year is still unexpended. It has been allocated; the work has been started on some of it; but we shall not reach the peak for some months in the future. New projects, however, will not be undertaken.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I referred to.

Mr. BURKE. Of course, that is what the Senator from Arizona meant.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not see how what I said could be construed in any other way.

Mr. BURKE. I wanted it to be clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the amendment reported by the committee. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. HOLT (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this question. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if present he would vote "nay." If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] because of illness. He has, however, a special pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that those Senators if present and voting would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business. These Senators, I am advised, if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. If present and

voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I am advised that he would vote as I intend to vote on this amendment, and I, therefore, feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the pair on this question of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. If present, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

Andrews	Frazier	Maloney	Russell
Ashurst	Green	Mead	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Hatch	Murray	Slattery
Borah	Hayden	Neely	Smathers
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Norris	Stewart
Connally	Hughes	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Donahay	La Follette	Pepper	Wheeler
Downey	Lee	Pittman	
Ellender	McCarran	Reynolds	

NAYS—38

Adams	Clark, Mo.	Herring	Reed
Austin	Davis	Holman	Taft
Bailey	George	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Bankhead	Gerry	King	Townsend
Barkley	Gibson	Lodge	Vandenberg
Bridges	Gillette	Lucas	Van Nuys
Bulow	Guffey	McKellar	Walsh
Burke	Gurney	Miller	White
Byrd	Hale	Minton	
Capper	Harrison	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—20

Barbour	Chavez	McNary	Smith
Bone	Glass	Overton	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Holt	Schwartz	Truman
Byrnes	Logan	Sheppard	Tydings
Caraway	Lundeen	Shipstead	Wiley

So Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 114.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$203,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "\$13,769,418"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "\$14,697,732"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "\$26,704,297"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$681,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the

sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$40,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "\$46,965,730"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32, 33, 141, 142, and 158.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
DAVID D. TERRY,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5269, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 28, 1939.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 142 to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For research and demonstration work in soil-conservation control measures, including research and demonstration work in fire-control and irrigation-construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, \$75,000: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida for the same purposes."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert a period and "Notwithstanding any such determination by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, this provision shall not be construed to prevent any criminal process against any person who was a party to or had guilty knowledge of such fraud or misrepresentation."

That the House further insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to said bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, to what bill does this action of the House relate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have just submitted the second conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. This concludes legislative action on the bill, if the Senate will agree to the motion I am about to make.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33, 141, and 158.

The motion was agreed to.

WORK-RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last evening the amendment on page 21, beginning in line 14, was passed over in order that I might prepare an amendment to it. I have prepared it and will submit it to the Senator from Colorado, and I think he will accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, at the end of line 19, it is proposed to insert

Provided, however, That such preference need not apply when it results in undue hardship.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the proviso merely softens somewhat the provision of the committee amendment, which makes it automatically necessary to discharge one who has been employed 18 months if someone who has been on the roll 3 months applies for employment. It seems to me there ought to be some discretion in the Commissioner, that if such a contingency should arise which would result in undue hardship, the Commissioner should not be compelled to discharge a man under those circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, we could not hear what the amendment was.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the amendment offered by the Senate committee, on page 21, those who have been employed on projects for 18 months must give way to any on the certified list for 3 months who have not been able to secure positions with the W. P. A. I interpret this provision to be almost mandatory, in the event some one on the certified list for as much as 3 months applies for a position held by someone else who has been on the job for 18 months.

My amendment merely provides that when the discharge of the man employed would result in undue hardship, the Commissioner shall not be compelled to give preference to the new man who is seeking the position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over is at the top of page 6, and will be reported by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 6, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "in the aggregate the sum of \$45,000,000 during the fiscal year 1940, of which sum the amounts so to be obligated for the following respective purposes shall not exceed these sums: Salaries, \$40,000,000; communication service, \$600,000; travel, \$4,200,000; and printing and binding \$500,000", and to insert "4 percent of the total amount made available in this section to such Administration."

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, it was because of an amendment I desire to submit that I asked the Senator from Colorado to have the amendment passed over. I understand that there may be some question of administration.

The amendment I am about to submit to the Senate reads as follows:

The Administrator shall furnish upon request to any Member of Congress the names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose wage or pay is a thousand or more dollars annually.

Mr. President, let us find out where the money is going, and what they consider to be "administration." I believe they are hiding over a hundred million dollars under the term "project supervision," which is actually administration, and they say that it is none of our business to know how it is spent. I read one letter this morning. Let me read another letter from the W. P. A. Administrator in reply to my request for the pay roll. He said:

We have not made it a practice to give out information concerning the individual salaries and addresses of employees except those in a position to formulate policy or direct major portions of the operations. We have felt that the public could have no legitimate interest in such information and that its release would very possibly result in these persons being subjected to solicitation from salesmen and the gossip of neighbors.

This is the only pay roll of a Government department that is not open to public inspection. City pay rolls are open, county pay rolls are open, State pay rolls are open, all Federal pay rolls are open except the W. P. A. pay rolls, and they are not open even to a Member of the Senate, who must pass upon the appropriations. For this reason I feel that Congress should put this amendment into the law,

so that the W. P. A. cannot get around it, so that it will be stated as the actual legislative policy that the Administrator shall be required to give the information to Congress when it desires to have it.

Mr. ADAMS and Mr. REED addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. If I heard the amendment correctly, it would enable any Member of Congress to get the complete list of employees drawing more than a certain sum throughout the United States. It is not limited to the District of a Representative or the State of a Senator, as I understood it.

Mr. HOLT. I am perfectly willing to limit it.

Mr. ADAMS. There are 38,000 employees, roughly, and I am thinking of the clerical work which might be involved.

Mr. HOLT. I can appreciate that, and I shall be glad to confine it to the names, positions, addresses and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration in the State of the Congressman.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the Senator from West Virginia. I merely wanted to inquire the date of the letter he read.

Mr. HOLT. I do not have the exact date of the one I just read. The last one was dated October 20, 1938. I read it in reply to the Senator from Michigan this morning.

Mr. REED. Who signed that letter?

Mr. HOLT. The one I read relating to gossiping neighbors was signed by Mr. Hopkins. The other was signed by Mr. Williams. Both of them refused the information.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator very much. I heartily agree with the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, if he will confine it perhaps so as to make the administration simpler, according to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HOLT. I think the suggestion is wise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am perfectly in sympathy with the idea that these records should be available, but it seems to me a little unusual that the entire pay rolls should be available upon the request of any Member of Congress. Why not have a mandatory provision in the law that a report should be made to Congress periodically, every month, let us say, or at any convenient time, so that the information will be available to Members of Congress? It is a little unusual to provide that individual Members of Congress may call upon any department for a list of its employees, so that they could get them for their own individual benefit. The information ought to be reported to Congress, it seems to me, and we could make such use of it as we saw fit.

I make the suggestion to the Senator because I think it is an unusual precedent to provide that any Member of Congress can, upon writing a letter, get a list of all the employees in any department of the Government drawing more than \$1,000 a year. Would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. HOLT. The reason why I do not think that answers the problem is that the W. P. A. has taken an unusual attitude toward this matter. It is the only department of the Government that refuses the pay roll. I hope so, at least.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. I am not so certain that I could write a letter to the Interior Department, or to any other department, and get a list of the employees drawing a certain salary. I have never attempted it, and I am not certain that I would not get the same sort of reply the Senator received. Regardless of all that, however, it seems to me unusual to put such a list at the disposal of any individual Member of Congress. We might as well say that any Member of Congress could write to the Secretary of the Treasury and get a list of all those who pay income taxes over a certain amount. Those lists are available to Congress.

Mr. HOLT. That is entirely different, because that is a private record, but this is information as to an expenditure of public money.

Mr. BARKLEY. The income-tax record is a private record, but it is a private record with reference to a public matter, that is, the payment of taxes. There is an analogy between the two. I am just suggesting this to the Senator in the interest of good, orderly legislation, because I think, after all, it is going quite far. I am not going to oppose the amendment in its present form, if it is voted on in this form, but I do think it would be better to provide a mandatory provision that the reports should be sent to Congress. Then any Congressman could obtain them for any use.

Mr. HOLT. That would entail decidedly more work on the W. P. A., because some Senators might not want the information.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose all of them did want it, and they wrote separate letters; the W. P. A. would have to make 96 separate replies.

Mr. HOLT. It certainly would not hurt them to make reports on the expenditure of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. They might have to employ more W. P. A. workers to get the reports out, if we made the request.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HOLT. With pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from West Virginia, and also to the Senator from Kentucky, that it seems to me either one of the proposals is too broad and that to carry either proposal into effect would be too expensive. To carry out the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia would take a great deal of time; it would consume the time probably of one or more clerks in each division, wherever there was a large number, and under the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky there would be someone making reports regularly right along every 2 weeks or every month, and that would consume much time.

There is another objection, however, which it seems to me is more important than what I have suggested. I believe these lists ought to be public, that anyone ought to be able to have access to a public record. If we leave it as the Senator from West Virginia has it, we will subject Members of Congress to very serious criticism. It will be claimed at once, it seems to me, that they are building up a fence around themselves, and that access inside will be denied to the public. Conceive the result. It seems to me that hundreds of times, in very election where a Member of Congress will be running for reelection and someone is opposing him who is not a Member of Congress, there will be available a list of names, a list of voters, in the State or in the district where the election is held. That list will be worth something. It will be accessible to the Member of Congress and not accessible to his opponent, and there will be criticism, which it seems to me will be justified.

We cannot afford to pass a law providing that there shall be furnished to us a list of names of voters which we do not permit our opponents to have. Why could not the Senator modify his amendment so as to provide that the list shall be made public, so as to give access to the list to anyone interested in getting the names? I think the Senator's idea is a good one. I am in favor of his proposal. However, I do not wish to surround it with what seems to me to be a dangerous limitation, in that we would have available a list of names which our opponents could not obtain.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I feel that every individual should have a right to know how every penny of relief money is spent, but I do not know of any way the information can be made public except in the manner suggested. Other agencies publish such information, but the emergency agencies do not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it would be easy to provide by law that these records shall be public records.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all that has to be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is really all that is necessary, and then anyone who is interested could go and look at them.

In addition to what the Senator from Nebraska has said, we heard in connection with the tax bill the other day about a sort of a racket. It was called to our attention by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. Someone was selling at so much per page or per list the names of those who made over \$15,000 a year as salaries in private industry. We adopted an amendment to the measure which prohibited the publication of any such information.

I am afraid that someone who may want to sell a list of W. P. A. workers could get hold of it and sell it to someone who wants to advertise or to write letters to those on the list, or even use the list for political or other purposes. They might be in a position to impose upon the very men and women who are employed. They might even obtain such a list, and then send out an advertisement asking, "How much will you pay me for it?" We know that lists of voters are obtained from the registration books in every courthouse in the United States by those interested in getting them, and then are sold for some purpose, either to mail-order houses or to somebody running for office or someone else.

Mr. President, I certainly would not want to see W. P. A. workers harassed and imposed upon in such a manner.

Mr. HOLT. The W. P. A. workers will not come under the provisions of the amendment. It refers to those who are above the security wage.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know it refers to those making above a thousand dollars. However, they are on W. P. A., and if they are on W. P. A. they would be working for that particular branch of Government. However great the value of the information may be, however much we may be entitled to it and the public may be entitled to it, I do not want to see an amendment put into the measure which would make W. P. A. workers victims of men who might wish to harass them simply because they could get a list of their names.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know whether or not I heard the Senator from Kentucky correctly. I merely wish to be sure. Did the Senator say that he was afraid that the W. P. A. and W. P. A. workers might be used for political purposes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; I did not say that; because I am satisfied that probably some of them have already been used in the way of voting. I do not know of any rule which would deny a man running for office the right to electioneer with a W. P. A. worker who is a voter. What I said was that I did not want a list created in such a manner as to give to some advertising company or some mail-order house or somebody running for office an exclusive right to have such a list or obtain it and harass W. P. A. workers.

Mr. BAILEY. I merely want to say that I very much regret that I did not hear the Senator say that he had become afraid that the W. P. A. might be used for political purposes. I was hoping that he was becoming a little fearful on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not catch the Senator's remark. He was hoping what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said that he was hoping something. I did not catch the word.

Mr. BAILEY. I was hoping the Senator was becoming a little fearful that the W. P. A. might be used for political purposes. I regret that the Senator did not say it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know just what implication the Senator has in his mind when he says he hopes I was beginning to become fearful. From the time the W. P. A. was established by Congress, I have here and elsewhere advocated openly and aboveboard that the W. P. A. should not be used for political purposes, and that no man who works for it should be harassed or intimidated or coerced or in any way dealt with by reason of the fact that he had such employment. I have never approved of or in any way sanctioned such practices.

Mr. BAILEY. I had reference to the Senator's impassioned appeal to us just as we were about to adjourn last

year on the subject of allowing those on W. P. A. the same freedom that was enjoyed by those who worked for the road commission or the highway commission in his State.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no apology for the statement I then made, and I do not retract what I then said—that a man working for the W. P. A. or any other branch of the Government ought to be as free in the exercise of his political rights as any other man working for anyone else in the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and that the Congress ought not to pass a measure, as we then intended to do and were about to pass, known as the Hatch measure. I wish to say that the statement made by the Senator that an annual report made about the matter that the Senator from West Virginia has in mind will not cover the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not say annual report only. I said we can compel them to make it as often as we want to.

Mr. BAILEY. We have very many temporary projects. It would not do us any good at the end of the year to know that on certain temporary projects more persons had been employed than were necessary. Mr. President, we are responsible for the administration of the work projects.

I am not disposed to bring up matters of this kind, but I happen to know of a small project in my State. I think its cost was \$85,000. A friend in the city who had been working on the project filed with me a letter giving the names of 12 different persons serving on that project in the capacity of supervisors and in other positions. There were 12 of them supervising one small project. It happened to be on the eve of a local election. I filed a letter with the Administrator. I do not know what happened. He said he would investigate. I have never heard anything more about it. But that is happening in America. When a little project to provide work for people who are destitute is undertaken local politicians as well as Members of Congress and other men who undertake to manage this thing politically step right in and get one man appointed at \$1,200 a year and another one at \$1,400 a year; one is a timekeeper, the other is a supervisor, the other is an overseer. One looks after the ditching; the other looks after the banking; and the other looks after the woodwork. Senators will find that the W. P. A. has been loaded down from the beginning with that sort of thing.

The Senator from West Virginia is now simply asking that we adopt an amendment which will enable the Members of the Congress, who are responsible for the appropriation of this money, and ought to be responsible for its wise expenditure, to obtain the necessary information when they want it. A great furor is raised about this and that in order to prevent that being done. I am in favor of the amendment. I am in favor of the reformers standing for reform. They are on the inside now, but they should not cover up.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am a new Member of this body, Mr. President, and the first discussion in which I participated had to do with the confirmation of a former Administrator of the W. P. A. There was available the report of the committee of this body, which investigated the W. P. A. last year, the chairman of which committee was the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. That report divulged a great deal of mismanagement and corruption in the W. P. A. From that day to this every additional disclosure has shown more waste, more extravagance, more corruption.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] stood on the Senate floor and said it was the fault of Congress, and that the W. P. A. Administrator, who is now Secretary of Commerce, should not be held responsible, because the Congress had failed in its duty to prevent corruption in the administration of W. P. A.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate—and I beg the pardon of the Senator from West Virginia for taking up his time—

Mr. HOLT. Go right ahead, Senator.

Mr. REED. I call attention to the language on page 31, section 29, in the measure we are now considering, where it is provided:

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to solicit, or knowingly be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the campaign expenses of any individual or political party from any person receiving compensation or employment provided for by this joint resolution.

On page 32 in section 30 is some additional language dealing with that phase.

I say to the Senate that here is its opportunity to put a final stop to this extravagance and waste of W. P. A. funds appropriated by the Congress. The amendment possibly may not be in the most perfect shape that could be conceived, but if the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia should be adopted, and any Member of Congress could obtain this information at any time, it is my belief, Mr. President, that it would be made public quickly enough, and be available for public purposes, and would put a stop to these abuses. If the Senate is fair with itself and fair with the public it will adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to point out to the Senator with reference to the comment made by the senior Senator from Kentucky that the provision which was adopted the other day by way of amendment to the tax bill, provided that there was to be no sale of the information contained in the list in question. It did not prohibit publication by newspapers or magazines or any other legitimate or proper sources, for the dissemination of public information. I thought that perhaps should be recalled to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator. I wish to make a further statement about this matter. The Senator from Kentucky said that certain persons will procure the lists and sell them to others. I have always felt that the expenditure of public money is a public business, and whenever any person starts to hide public business we had better watch that individual, regardless of who he may be or where he may be employed. My amendment does not seek to have divulged the names of individuals on relief. All it seeks to do is to make available the names of individuals who make over \$1,000 a year out of the relief funds. If the amendment should be adopted, Congress would save the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars because that is where they are hiding the waste in the W. P. A., and getting away with it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my approval of the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. I am reminded of the expression used by President Woodrow Wilson. He said, "Let light into the dark places." That is what this amendment would do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that this matter be taken to conference. Perhaps it can be worked out so that the language would be more scientific. I see no harm in taking it to conference and trying to work it out.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to point out further that we can limit the sale of this information.

Mr. HOLT. I do not think there has been any question about the use of the information. The information has been limited to only a few. It has not been available to the public. If one is on the inside, he can obtain it. I know it has been done just that way. Nevertheless, I wish to have the Senate go on record in a roll-call vote on this question, so that there will be no excuse for the conferees to say, "We accepted it as a matter of course. We do not care about it."

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the clerks did not get his amendment as he read it. If the Senator will send it to the desk, it will be very helpful.

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to send my amendment to the desk.

Now, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the proper place, it is proposed to insert:

The Administrator shall furnish upon request to any Member of Congress the names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose wage or pay is \$1,000 or more annually.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia, who has thought about the matter, would modify his amendment, I believe a serious objection to it could be met. I am in favor of publicity. I should like to have not only the salaries of \$1,000 and more but all salaries made public records, which anybody could obtain if he were interested enough to inquire. We talk about publicity and the great good it does. Here we have an amendment which does not give publicity. I admit that the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators in good faith have taken the view that it does provide publicity. However, such an amendment would place a handicap upon Members of Congress. If such an amendment were adopted, we should see flaming headlines announcing that Members of Congress have shielded themselves; that they are able to obtain information which is denied to the public. Technically that objection applies to the amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to permit me to modify my amendment so as to provide that such salary lists shall be matters of public record?

Mr. NORRIS. Absolutely.

Mr. HOLT. Then I shall add that provision to the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not need to do that.

Mr. HOLT. I should like to have the amendment specific and then add the provision that such lists shall be matters of public record.

Mr. NORRIS. That would greatly help.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that if I write to the W. P. A. to obtain these lists and they are sent to me in a letter, then they become public records? How are we going to make them public records unless we provide by law that they shall be public records?

Mr. NORRIS. If we had the right kind of an amendment that would be the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. The information ought not to have to be sent to me as an individual Senator in order to be a public record. That is the point I am trying to impress upon the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is a valid objection. The amendment ought to provide that the lists shall be public records, accessible to all persons at any reasonable hour. Everybody would not want to obtain them; but persons who were interested could obtain them. If I were running for Congress in a certain district, perhaps I would want the lists. I could obtain them. The Administrator would have to send them to me. However, my opponent could not obtain them. What would the public say to that? What would any honest man say to that?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I should simply say that the lists shall be available to any citizen of the United States at any reasonable hour.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; as all public records are. These lists are not any different from any other public records. It seems to me that would not only be fair to everybody but it would shield Members of Congress themselves from the charge which would be made if we should provide by law that we shall be entitled to such lists, but nobody else shall be.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I agree entirely with the Senator from Nebraska. About a year ago complaint was made to me about the large number of persons in the Works Progress Administration who were receiving large salaries. I went to the Administrator. Of course, he knew the names of all those individuals and the salaries they were paid. I suggested to the Administrator that he ought to have in his office a list of such persons, available to any person who desired to inquire. I think the Administrator in every State or every district ought to make available to any person the list of those who are on the W. P. A.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I accept the modifications suggested by the Senator, that such information shall also be available to any citizen of the United States during office hours at the Works Progress Administration headquarters.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think that provision ought to be in the amendment. I do not believe the Administrator should be required to send such lists to Members of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to accept a substitute in the following language:

The names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose wage, salary, or pay is \$1,000 or more annually, shall be public records and available to any citizen of the United States.

Mr. HOLT. That is satisfactory. I want it to be understood that that information is not hidden.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be a public record and available to any citizen. It could not be hidden.

Mr. HOLT. I think that language would be satisfactory.

Mr. President, I accept the modification, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the yeas and nays have been ordered upon the amendment first tendered by the Senator from West Virginia. The rules of the Senate require unanimous consent in order to modify it thereafter. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from West Virginia. He can obtain a writ of non exeat facendum, or a writ of some other sort and compel the disclosure to him of those names, under the language used by the Senator from Kentucky. If the Senator wishes to accomplish the result he seeks, he should keep his amendment in the form in which it was in the beginning, and go ahead and fight it out.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suppose I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not yielded the floor to any other Senator. However, no one has paid any attention to me or the fact that I have the floor. Since I have the floor, I should like to say just one word in reply.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is not the only one.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I did not know the Senator had the floor. I thought the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Holt] had the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not complaining about that. However, Mr. President, I am complaining about Senators who intimate or suggest that anyone is trying to cover something up. I do not think that it is in the mind of any Senator. The Senator from West Virginia has opened up a question which I think is important. I believe his ideas are correct about it.

All I care for is that the amendment should be broad enough so as not to injure anybody, and so that the charge may not be made that we are trying to cover up our own tracks. I think that charge would lie against the amendment as originally framed. If we said to any department of the Government, "You must give us a list whenever we write for it, and nobody else may obtain it," we would be open to such a charge. In a campaign for the House of Representatives or the Senate, lists are very important. They are used by all candidates and all parties for all kinds of purposes. The purposes may be honorable or dishonorable. But if the lists are public records, whatever the purpose may be, any citizen is entitled to obtain them. I do not wish to cover up these lists. Any insinuation that because we want a modification of the amendment we are trying to cover up something or we are not trying to do our duty is unjustified and uncalled for, so far as I am able to see.

The Senator from West Virginia has offered an amendment on a very important subject. It is an important amendment. He is entitled to credit for offering it, and he is entitled to credit for the manly way in which he has received any constructive suggestions to improve it. It seems to me there is no need for us to do anything but to get the amendment in proper shape so that it will apply to everybody and give no one an advantage.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky read the amendment as he feels it should be?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have reduced it to writing. Let me see if it does not satisfy the situation:

The names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose compensation is \$1,000 per annum or more shall be public records and available to any citizen of the United States, and shall be reported on the 1st of each month to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOLT. I think that is satisfactory.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion? I suggest that the Senator strike out the words "\$1,000 or more" so that it would apply to everybody.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the opinion of the author of the amendment, whoever is the author. If the words "\$1,000 or more" were stricken out, would not a person on work relief be considered an employee within the meaning of the amendment? Is that the desire of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator repeat his question.

Mr. HATCH. It was suggested that the words "\$1,000 or more" be stricken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that if we include everybody—

Mr. NORRIS. That may be going too far.

Mr. BARKLEY. It means the name of every laboring man in a ditch somewhere digging a trench to lay a pipe; and it means everybody who works as much as a week. I think what the Senator from West Virginia is trying to get at is the salary lists of those who receive \$1,000 or more from the W. P. A.

Mr. HOLT. The bosses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that would include the bosses. I am sure they draw more than \$1,000 a year. I think the amendment ought to be limited to \$1,000, because otherwise it would include every man who works for a day or a week on some project.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. May I inquire from the Senator from Kentucky whether or not the amendment, in the shape he now has it, would require waiting until the end of the year to determine whether or not a man had received \$1,000 or more? If the Senator from West Virginia is going to change the original form of his amendment and adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky, should not the language be "at the rate of \$1,000 or more annually"?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it might be; but if the words "at the rate of" are used, that means that if a man is working for a dollar and a half a day—of course, it would be impossible for that to amount to a thousand dollars a year—but if he is working only for a day for \$5 a day, or \$2.50 a day, whatever the rate is, if he works only a day or a week he is working at the rate of something a year in case he works all the year at that rate; so we do not get away from the difficulty to which I called attention.

I do not think it is worth while to be too technical over this matter. What the Senator from West Virginia is trying to do, and what we are all trying to do, is to get a list that is public property of those who are getting \$1,000 a year or more. It seems to me that is sufficient.

Mr. HOLT. I think the Senator is wise in that suggestion, because after the adoption of the amendment we should have to wait for a year to determine the compensation. I think "at the rate of" would specifically give us a list at the end of July; and I think the amendment should be modified to that effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will modify the amendment by putting in the words "at the rate of \$1,000 per annum or more," so that it can be worked out. I have no objection to that modification. I think, though, it probably would require a report on a man who worked a month and never worked any more.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it seems to me that would be all right. The authorities might conceivably put on the employees just before election and work them for a month. I think the expression should be "at the rate of."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota. Then I will yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Has the Senator accepted an amendment striking out the words "one thousand"?

Mr. HOLT. No; I did not do that, because I do not want it said that I am trying to get the names of relief clients. I do not care about the names of relief clients. I want to know who the bosses are.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLT. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I do think it is advisable, if the Senator from Kentucky will permit me, to insert in the amendment the words "at the rate of."

Mr. BARKLEY. I have done it, and I am hoping we may vote.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, let the clerk read the amendment so that we may have a ye-a-and-nay vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I may modify my own amendment, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may show the substitute which I am offering, and which I understand the Senator from West Virginia accepts, I will read it and let the Official Reporter take it:

The names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all employees of the Work Projects Administration whose compensation is at the rate of \$1,000 per annum or more, shall be public records, and shall be available to any citizen of the United States on request, and shall be reported on the first of each month to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] to the amendment reported by the committee. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it seems to me it ought to be made plain that the amendment is not meant to include those on the relief rolls. As a matter of fact, at the present time there are on the relief rolls persons who are paid at the rate of more than \$1,000 a year.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment is a modification of my amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a substitute for it.

Mr. HOLT. I should like to accept it as a modification of my amendment, if the Senator from Kentucky does not object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no. Does the Senator desire to have it as a modification of his amendment?

Mr. HOLT. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kentucky if the language of his substitute provides for furnishing information about the amount of the compensation?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it provides for furnishing the names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all such employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment having been accepted by the Senator from West Virginia, the question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] to the amendment reported by the committee. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if that Senator were present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHONEY (when Mr. SCHWARTZ's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained because of illness.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if that Senator were present he would vote as I shall vote, so I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], if present, would vote "yea" on this question.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—66

Andrews	Gerry	Lee	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Gibson	Lodge	Shipstead
Austin	Gillette	Lucas	Slattery
Bailey	Green	McCarran	Stewart
Bankhead	Guffey	McKellar	Taft
Barkley	Gurney	Maloney	Tobey
Bridges	Hale	Mead	Townsend
Burke	Harrison	Miller	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Minton	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Hayden	Norris	Van Nuys
Connally	Herring	Nye	Wagner
Danaher	Holman	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Davis	Holt	Pittman	Wheeler
Downey	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	White
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wiley
Frazier	King	Reynolds	
George	La Follette	Russell	

NAYS—3

Adams	Murray	Smathers
-------	--------	----------

NOT VOTING—27

Barbour	Capper	Hughes	Schwartz
Bilbo	Caraway	Logan	Sheppard
Bone	Chavez	Lundeen	Smith
Borah	Clark, Idaho	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Donahay	Neely	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Glass	Overton	Tydings
Byrnes	Hill	Pepper	

So Mr. Holt's modified amendment to the amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to ascertain if we cannot enter into an agreement for the limitation of debate. There are only two or three more committee amendments, and I think they are not of a major character.

I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the consideration of the joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the joint resolution or more than once or longer than 10 minutes on any amendment.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 13, after the words "shall be", to strike out:

available—

(a) After June 30, 1939, for the operation of any theater project; or

(b) After August 31, 1939.,

And insert "available after October 31, 1939," so as to read:

SEC. 25. None of the funds made available by this title shall be available after October 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Works Project Administration.

And so forth.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have a textual amendment, merely changing a date to conform to changes which have been made in the text, which I should like to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to strike out "July 1, 1939, or September 1, 1939, as the case may be," and to insert in lieu thereof "November 1, 1939."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, since it relates to the House text; and, without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The amendment simply provides that not more than 1 percent of the entire amount may be set aside to be available for projects exclusively sponsored by the Works Progress Administration. I have conferred with the Senator in charge of the bill, and, while he has not stated that he favors the amendment, he has no objection to its going to conference.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the amendment relates to theaters, does it?

Mr. WAGNER. It does. It is purely discretionary.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would relate also to musical and art projects.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; or any other project which cannot possibly be locally sponsored. The amount is very small.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be considered to be in order, since it amends certain portions of the House text.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I understand the amendment calls for an expenditure of not more than 1 percent of the entire amount to be appropriated for the benefit of W. P. A. I should like to inquire as to what that 1 percent of the entire amount would be?

Mr. WAGNER. About \$14,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like at this time to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate one phase of the relief bill we now have under consideration about which many have perhaps forgotten, that is, the W. P. A. theater project, which the Senator from New York just mentioned, and how it is being used by clever Communists to spread throughout the land their doctrine of destruction of American institutions.

It is with regret that I express my opposition to the theater project, particularly because some really worth-while things have been done in that activity. But they are far overshadowed by the damage done and the danger to America from the "red" propaganda being broadcast by the majority of the plays and the presentations of the theater project.

Among the worth-while accomplishments is the dramatization of events in America's glorious history, such as that of the Lost Colony of Roanoke Island, which has been put on several years past in my State of North Carolina, a very excellent picturization of American history. I wish every man here might see that presentation. The President of the United States was in North Carolina several years ago, at which time he was provided an opportunity of seeing that play. I am sure there must be a few others as meritorious as this project, but I very seriously doubt it.

By and large, however, the control of the W. P. A. theater project and most of its plays is in the hands of Communists, spreading the doctrine of communism at the expense of the American taxpayer. If the American taxpayers are desirous of paying for the spreading of communistic propaganda and literature all over this country, that is their business, but I am sure that the Members of this body know enough about the sentiments of their constituents to have already ascertained as to whether or not they are desirous of voting funds to continue to spread the communistic propaganda at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, this fact alone should compel us to condemn the W. P. A. theater project to the ashcan of oblivion. Its sins far outweigh its good deeds.

We are now asked to dip deeper into every American taxpayer's pocket so that the Government can continue in the show business, losing millions upon millions of dollars, and paying the bills for the dissemination of the revolution made in Russia by the hundreds of radicals who have chiseled into the control of the project at the expense of the Treasury.

According to the amendment just offered, the author of which is the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], he is asking us to vote \$14,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to those in this country who are spreading the doctrines of communism and who are bent upon either changing our form of government or overthrowing the present Government of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the Senator does not mean to imply that everyone engaged in the theater business is a Communist?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the Senator realizes that there are many splendid citizens of America who are engaged in that line of business.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Unquestionably, absolutely.

Mr. McCARRAN. If, perchance, there may be on the relief rolls men or women who are inclined to favor communism, but who are American citizens, nevertheless, should we deny relief to unemployed and starving Americans simply because here and there there may arise something which savors of communism?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. My thought, following my question, is that the more we bring communism out into the open, the more America understands it, the more it will know what it is condemning.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Quite so.

Mr. McCARRAN. America should condemn communism, but it should know what it is condemning before it condemns. Therefore if, perchance, there might be a play put on somewhere which had a communistic trend, would the Senator thereby condemn every actor?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Or every musician?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Every artist; everyone of those who might benefit by the 1 percent of this appropriation?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator agrees with me, then I say that we cannot condemn the whole project because there may be some within it who are wrong.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am quite in accord with the Senator, but I wish to say to the Senator at this juncture that I oppose the expenditure of \$14,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of this country for the purpose of spreading doctrines which are un-American.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the American people do not need to be taught, through the theater or through any other instrumentality, what communism is. We know what it is. We know its evil propensities, we know its objectives, and if any of the theaters which are being subsidized are engaged in propaganda in favor of communism, I think we ought not to go into the Treasury of the United States and aid them in their communistic activities.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator. Now, in reference to the statement made by the Senator from Nevada, permit me to say that at the outset this evening I spoke of the lost colony at Manteo, Roanoke Island, N. C. There is nothing with reference to the play picturing that incident which pertains to communism, and I am absolutely confident and positive that no one with communistic leanings is now, ever has been, or ever will be connected with that project, and I should dislike very much indeed to see that project interfered with as a result of what I now present for the attention of Senators.

But I will say to the Senator that if the project has to be hampered as a result of lack of appropriations it would be best to hamper it rather than to permit projects all over the United States to continue as they have been going, under the direction of those who are spreading communistic propaganda. I say that the time has come when the representatives of the American people should say to them whether they are for those who are supposed to represent our form of government or whether they are for the Communists. The American people are demanding that we let them know where we stand, and I am trying now to let them know where I stand.

Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that I am

standing in the rear of the Chamber; and when it is convenient for him to look back this way, I should like to have him consider me.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should be very happy to consider the Senator from Florida, but at the time he arose my attention was attracted by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am very much in sympathy with the contentions of the Senator from North Carolina, but I call his attention to page 25 of the committee print, paragraph (b) of section 18, which I supported in the committee. It is as follows:

No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates * * * the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

It may be that that protects the appropriation along the line where the Senator is looking for protection.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution, and I will say to him that I am in high hopes that that portion of the paragraph he read will provide protection for those who are engaged in projects if they are continued. That is for the protection of American citizens who are not preaching the doctrine of communism.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the very fine utterance of the Senator from North Carolina is concurred in by me, but the Senator from North Carolina cannot brand me, and I do not believe he can brand other Members of the Senate, as being in sympathy with communism because we may vote to feed some hungry people who practice a particular art or follow a particular vocation. We deprecate and we despise anything which would tear down American institutions. I do not belong to a class which ever yielded on that subject. We fought for and we will die for American institutions. But because there might be here or there someone who might express himself as he saw fit does not justify branding a great class of hungry people who have given themselves to a particular art as being all communistic. So that I am not ready to say that those who are hungry and out of employment but, nevertheless, belong to the theater class or the musician class, are all Communists. I am going to vote for the amendment, because I want the hungry fed, not because I want to encourage communism.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, the Senator knows that it was furthest from my thought to infer that anyone here was in sympathy with the Communists. I know that there is no one in this body who is in sympathy with them. As for feeding the hungry, I have voted for every appropriation for the W. P. A., to help the unfortunate men and women who are out of employment, to provide them with food and shelter and clothing, and the only time I have failed to vote for appropriations was when recently we were asked to appropriate \$150,000,000, and appropriated only \$100,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say that I am going to continue to vote for appropriations from the Treasury of the United States so long as there is a hungry man or so long as there is a hungry woman in the United States. We can get money to do other things, and we can get money to do that. I am directing my remarks toward those workers of the Federal theater project who are allied and associated with and are members of the Communist Party. I know, as others know, that there are thousands of fine men and women in the W. P. A. project who are bitterly opposed to the Communists who are associated therein with them, and many Communists have charge of the W. P. A. projects.

I gladly yield now to my distinguished colleague the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator from North Carolina aware of the fact that beginning on page 24 of the joint resolution there appears the following provision?—

Sec. 18. (a) No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless such person before engaging in such employment (or prior to August 1, 1939, in the case of any person employed before such

date who has not taken an oath of office) subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am familiar with it. In addition to that, I think the measure requires that every person securing work on W. P. A. must of necessity have made an affidavit to the effect that he is a citizen of the United States of America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator also aware that immediately succeeding that provision there is the following subsection (b) on page 25:

(b) No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is not the Senator satisfied that those two provisions contain an adequate safeguard against Communists, as the Senator describes them, being the recipients of the appropriations provided for in this measure?

Mr. REYNOLDS. A safeguard to a certain extent, quite true. In addition to providing certain safeguards, I will state to the Senator that I have prepared an amendment to the section on page 22 which will require every person to state in an affidavit his place of birth—if not born in the United States, then in his native country—the date of birth and place of entry into the United States.

The point I make is this: According to the amendment the Senator proposes, that we make expenditure of not more than 1 percent of the entire amount, which, I have been informed by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], will amount to about \$14,000,000. I am opposed to making an expenditure of \$14,000,000 for something from which the American people will not benefit, and I say that the American people have received less from their expenditures on W. P. A. as the result of the Federal theater project than anything else, and I do not see why we should be called upon to spend millions of dollars for a project merely for the purpose of protecting perhaps a minority element in this project, as mentioned by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator from North Carolina aware that there are approximately 7,000 persons now engaged in the theater project, and that that kind of work is the normal means of those people for making a livelihood, and if they are diverted into some other kind of work it is taking them out of the work they are fitted to do?

Mr. REYNOLDS. But the difficulty about the theater project is that real actors are not employed. Most of them are "hams." They play to empty houses. The receipts from the Federal theater projects will evidence to the minds of all who have read the hearings that the greater number of them, according to my recollection, are not real actors.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the other day when hearings were in progress before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee some of the most eminent actors and producers in this country upon the legitimate stage came here at their own expense, and they took a day to ask the Appropriations Committee, and through the Appropriations Committee the Senate, not to destroy the arts program that was being presented to the American people through the theater project?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am aware of that, but I am also aware of the fact that those gentlemen and ladies who testified are not working for the W. P. A. theater project.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator also aware that some of the most eminent actors in Hollywood, who are not working for the W. P. A., but such persons as Tallulah Bankhead and other eminent actors and actresses who came down here, do appreciate the contribution that this arts program is making to the American people? Is the Senator also aware of the fact that all these eminent artists who derive no personal benefit from the project, but who ought to know something of the legitimate stage, came here to testify about its worth to the American people, and not one of them receives any money from it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I read in the newspapers that they were here to testify in regard to the matter, but I did not read their testimony before the committee. I base my opinion upon certain pages of testimony that I have here from the record, which I will read in a moment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I will say that I have a break-down of the affiliation of the personnel of the Federal theater project in my home State. While I agree with the Senator in his desire to rid this and other projects and the country, so far as that is concerned, of the so-called "red" menace, I know the Senator will appreciate the affiliation of the personnel and recognize in it a bulwark against communism.

A break-down of the 3,222 people employed on the New York City Federal theater project as of the month of May 1939 reveals two things: That the vast majority belong to old-line and officially accredited union groups and that the belief that they are not professionally qualified theater people is untrue.

From this total of 3,222, let me cite a few figures: One thousand one hundred and fifty actors, 85 percent of whom belong to one or another theatrical union of long standing and the majority of them to Actors' Equity, an affiliate of the A. F. of L.; 417 stage hands, who are 100 percent members of the I. A. T. S. E., also an affiliate of the A. F. of L.; 300 musicians, all of them members of Local 302, American Federation of Musicians, an A. F. of L. affiliate; 200 shop employees, divided among 9 unions which, with the exception of the unaffiliated Public Address System Operators Union, are all A. F. of L. organizations; 23 box-office cashiers, all of them members of the Theatrical Managers, Agents, and Treasurers Union, affiliated with the A. F. of L.

The remainder, or 1,132, belonging to such groups as technicians, designers, promotion workers, and so forth, are to a large degree not affiliated with any professional union.

It is apparent that employees of the Federal theater project owe their allegiance to regular and professional A. F. of L. theatrical unions. The A. F. of L. unions in the theater can be accused neither of subversive actions nor of unprofessionalism.

The sponsorship would further indicate the removal of this project from alien or communistic influence. The co-sponsors in my State include public and parochial schools, Seamen's Home, Salvation Army, Ingleside Home, Twentieth Century Club, St. Giles Home, St. John's Church, Westminster House, American Legion, Adult Education Centers, Wheel-Chair Home, Mount St. Joseph's Normal School.

I know the Senator, in his lofty desire to put down communism, will agree at once that the sponsorship in the union affiliation, so far as my State is concerned, indicates that it squares with the high ideals of Americanism that the Senator is trying to bring out, and is bringing out, in the debate today. They want the Senator's help in order that they may vindicate rather than vitiate the high and lofty ideals for which they are fighting. The only way that can be brought about by such limiting and restricting amendments as the Senator from Florida has read to us,

is by way of acquiescence in the suggestion of the Senator that the matter may go to conference, and in order that Americanism, which I know is uppermost in the Senator's mind, may prove itself by the help and the assistance we shall give, by the adoption of the amendment, to the right-minded people, who outnumber all the others, as the Senator from Nevada well said, and who are included in this relief measure, and who need our succor, and our support.

I hope the Senator from North Carolina will continue his fight, and at the same time allow the amendment of the senior Senator from my State [Mr. WAGNER] to go to conference so that the Senator's program may be developed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the junior Senator from the State of New York for his fine contribution. I was particularly happy to have him read the names of those excellent organizations a moment ago, and I was vividly impressed by the mention of the American Federation of Labor and the American Legion, for the reason that I know, as most of us know, that the American Federation of Labor will not permit a Communist in its ranks, and the American Federation of Labor is fighting communism, as are the junior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from New York and all other Senators.

I recall with much pride that the junior Senator from New York has but recently returned from my State of North Carolina, where he delivered a marvelous address before the members of the American Legion at Raleigh, our State capital, at the convention of the American Legion, and I know and the Senator from New York knows that the American Legion is another one of those outstanding organizations of America which is constantly fighting communism.

I have been told and I have read and I have learned from some of the reports that the Workers Alliance, a subsidiary of the Communist Party in this country, is directing the activities of the theater projects; and I have received information in regard to this matter relative to activities of the Communists in our Government, under Government control, and that is the thing I am fighting.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain that I want to help the actors and the writers and others of similar professions who are unfortunate and are not able to find work, and in that respect are like plumbers and carpenters and bricklayers. A writer, however, cannot go out with a pick and shovel, as can those who have been accustomed to such work. My only idea and the only thing I have in mind is that which is uppermost in the minds of the junior Senator from New York, that if there is any part of this Government in which we find Communists actively engaged we want to get rid of that activity on the part of the Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the able Senator from North Carolina, because he has the floor, that I should like to express my views. America has nothing to fear from the standpoint of communism. The democracy that was born in this country was born to endure by reason of a knowledge of democracy. What we in America have to fear is fear itself produced by someone who forever and always talks about the bugbear of communism. If we will only bring communism out in the open, take it by the two ears and look into the eyes of the thing we shall have nothing to fear.

Communism is a protoplasm that lives in a media of fear, and nothing else, and so long as we have fear, so long will communism prevail, but so soon as we disperse fear and communism comes out into the open, then American democracy in all its grandeur, which has put communism down since the day it first arose, will put communism down again. The trouble is that there are those who forever use the bugbear of communism to scare someone in order that they themselves may rise up and thus be held up as the champions against the so-called danger of communism.

I wish more of communism could be brought into the open, so that the boys of America might learn to despise the thing from the cradle up. If we could only bring it out or forget our fear of it, and damn it, and crush it, it would go out of

existence so fast that the able Senator from North Carolina would not have to put forth the splendid energy he has displayed today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say to the Senator, in partial answer to what he has said, that I was very happy a moment ago that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] brought to the attention of the Members of this body an amendment to the joint resolution which provides that one who is opposed to the Government in thought or activity shall not be given any sort of employment under the appropriation we are about to make. I wish to say to the Senator that I am in perfect accord with what he has to say. I do not believe communism will ever reach the point in this country where Communists will take charge of the Government, as they have in Russia. They will never be able to make the progress in this country that they did in Spain. There was a tremendous tussle in old historic Spain; and during the trials and tribulations of that internal revolution, which lasted from July 1936 until only a few months ago, more than 2,000,000 people were slaughtered. I hope that communism will never gain the foothold in this country that it did in Spain, where it brought about the murder of hundreds of thousands of Christian people. I say that communism will never gain a foothold in this country to the extent of taking charge of the Government for the reason that Communists do not believe in God. Communists believe in the destruction of places of worship, and the American people will never be brought around to that viewpoint.

Mr. HOLT and Mr. HUGHES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANAHY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator from West Virginia has been endeavoring to obtain the floor for some purpose. I yield first to him, and then I shall be glad to yield to the able Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HOLT. Speaking of communism, the statement has been made that it appears only here and there in the theater project. In April 1936 the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the work of Mrs. Flanagan, who is in charge of theater projects, according to the Senator from Pennsylvania. Mrs. Flanagan wrote the play in which the leading character was a Communist by the name of Wardell. I read from the play. This is Wardell speaking:

Don't you see, Rose, it ain't Purcell that's wrong. It's the plan we live under; it's the whole system. Listen! Maybe I think, like you, that there'll come a time when there'll be shootin'. But today ain't the time. Maybe there'll come a time when we can stand on our feet like free men, instead of crawlin' on our bellies askin' for help. But that time ain't come yet. Some of us believe in a time comin' when everybody will have to work, and there'll be enough work for everybody. Some of us believe that the land and the crops and the cattle and the factories belong to the men that work 'em. But we ain't strong enough yet to take 'em. And that's why some of us think it's more important to work for that time than to shoot up a few rich guys now.

That is from the head of the theater project, according to the Senator from Pennsylvania; and he quotes his authority in Mrs. Flanagan's own words.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What was the name of the play? Was that the one called Barking for Your Supper?

Mr. HOLT. No; according to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the name of the play is Can You Hear Their Voices? I did not hear them.

Mr. REYNOLDS. To which Senator from Pennsylvania does the Senator refer?

Mr. HOLT. I refer to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] who put the material into the RECORD.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I see the senior Senator from Pennsylvania in the Chamber.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to yield. Has the Senator from West Virginia finished?

Mr. HOLT. Yes. I merely wanted to call attention to the head of the project, who says the plan is all wrong. "It is not yet time to kill them. We will kill them later, when we

have enough strength." That is the theory of the head of the theater project.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on April 20, 1936, I placed in the RECORD the material which was read by the junior Senator from West Virginia. I was thoroughly convinced at that particular time that those who were of the extreme radical type had practical control of the theater in New York. Since that time, and since we have begun to talk about this communistic group in the theater, a change has come about, and I believe it is a change for the better. The joint resolution now provides that W. P. A. administrators must take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. I think we are just now on the eve of taking these theatrical projects from the extremists. There have been, and there are now, some very fine people working in the W. P. A. theatrical projects.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely.

Mr. DAVIS. They are the finest people in the theatrical world. I was more or less connected with the show business in my younger day; and today I see the men of my age in that field unable to find work anywhere. If we did not provide for them under this project they would be out looking for a place with a pick and shovel, or some other kind of work, which would take away work from those accustomed to manual labor. I wish to read a letter which came to me under date of June 20:

I am writing to you to urge you to do what you can on behalf of the Federal theater W. P. A. project. I agree that this project has heretofore been manhandled by radicals in and around it. No doubt they could and should be eliminated in any new Federal theater project. Further changes could be provided to eliminate all those in the project who are not bona fide actors of long standing. This class of people, made up of individuals unsuited for manual labor, have spent their lifetime in the work of relieving us of our daily care once in a while, and are as much entitled to the provisions of W. P. A. as any other group of artisans or laborers who are in an impossible position at this time.

He goes on to say:

Frankly, I condemn many of the practices and abuses which have grown out of the W. P. A. system in this country. However, as long as we are having a W. P. A. I believe that this class of people to whom I have referred above ought to be provided for.

So do I. I believe in this project. I believe it could be administered in such a way as to give satisfaction to the people generally.

Let me read a letter from the other side of the question. Here is a letter from a young married woman who has had children:

MY DEAR SIR: I am not quite sure I could be most fervent in my plea for the retention of the Federal theater in W. P. A. and spending program now sent to the Senate. I cannot be explosive, nor can I beg. Perhaps it might better to state the story of the one typical Federal theater worker I know best—my father. All his life has been spent in the theater. He is now beyond the age where he is welcome in any other trade. He knows no other.

He has contributed much to the theater in the United States. At one time he was considered the very top as a director of stock. Radio, talking pictures, and the depression robbed him of his profession.

Mr. President, in my State today thousands of men have been robbed of their positions because of the machine age, and they are marching by the hundreds to get on the W. P. A. I see this actor, as I see others with whom I worked, marching today to try to get a job on W. P. A.

Listen to what this good woman says, speaking of her father:

He comes from an old family that settled in this country in 1623. Among his ancestors was a Governor of one of the earliest colonies. He is an American through and through.

I can see that actor in his younger days pleading for every charitable venture in my community, and doing his part. Now, he comes asking us to continue a project which might keep him from misery and want, the Federal theater.

This good woman goes on to say:

The Federal theater was a godsend to my father, after his workless years, just as it was to the thousands of actors everywhere, and they proved it by their subsequent records of achieve-

ment. They were not youngsters. They were seasoned professionals. What are people to do now? How are their families to live? My father has a child still dependent upon him. My husband and I can help but very little. We have a family of our own. I have always done my best and I shall continue to do so, but that can be very little, and will prove unsatisfactory.

O Mr. President, I know the time and the energy and the money he has contributed toward the cause which the Senator from North Carolina is advocating today. He has gone all over the country condemning those who are trying to undermine the Constitution of the United States. I do not know of a Senator who would not join with him to help crush communism in our midst. I agree with the Senator from Nevada that the sooner we bring it out in the open the better for us. But let us not throw these men of the stage out on the street. Let us not drive men to do things that they are not competent to do. Let us go ahead and clean our house of this communistic element, whether it be in the theater, in the factory, in the countinghouse, or wherever it may be. Let us wipe it out here in America, and not have a deserving man denied what he received under the W. P. A.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been seeking to obtain an agreement with respect to debate during the further consideration of the joint resolution. With the permission of the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], who objected to my previous request, I now modify the request I made a while ago. I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of this measure no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes on the joint resolution, nor more than once or longer than 15 minutes on any amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the senior Senator from Pennsylvania for his fine contribution to this debate. But let me once again make myself clear. I am in favor of providing employment for all actors, actresses, artists, and writers, so long as they are Americans; but I am opposed to spending any of the taxpayers' money to spread the propaganda of the Communists in this country.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. There was much ado a moment ago about the oath that was required to be taken. In the July issue of National Issues, published monthly by the National Committee of the Communist Party, on page 17, I find the following:

The much-referred-to oath that workers on W. P. A. would be required to take, a section in the bill apparently intended for face saving to WOODBRUM and his friends, makes the whole affair still more ridiculous. Communists will surely take that oath and take it with genuine sincerity.

In other words, it does not bother the Communists themselves.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What magazine is that from?

Mr. HOLT. It is from National Issues, for July 1939, on page 17.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Is that a communistic publication?

Mr. HOLT. On the inside cover it says:

Editor: Gene Dennis. Published monthly by national committee, Communist Party, U. S. A.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator. I believe no one will say that the Communists are not making headway in this country.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that the expression which the able Senator from West Virginia has read is undoubtedly true. Communism, as we understand it, has no regard for God, so any oath may be taken.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In reference to the spread of communism, I desire to remind the Members of this body that there are 168,000,000 inhabitants of Russia. I dare say

that the greater portion of them do not believe in communism, but nevertheless the minorities there are controlling the majority.

In addition to that, we know the headway they have made in Spain, the difficulties they caused there, and we know, in reference to the Asiatic situation, that about two-thirds of China is communistic and controlled by the Communists. At least we certainly know that both Inner Mongolia and Outer Mongolia are under the direction of independent soviet states.

Mr. President, we all have learned from the great works of the theater; we all have enjoyed the splendid and dramatic portrayals of life as presented across the stage. But, Mr. President, I ask the attention of every colleague for the moment to weigh carefully the tripe being served across the footlights by the W. P. A.

It is bad enough to have to put up with ham actors—actors of whom the New York newspapers say in their reviews that they "have not acted and never will," hundreds of whom have had only the thespian experience you and I got in going through high school, or maybe it was in Sunday school playlets when we were children.

But it is worse, Mr. President, when we look over the bill of fare the W. P. A. offers to sell its unsavory collection of communistic, un-American doctrines, its assortment of insidious and vicious ideologies, to the audiences drawn to W. P. A. presentations. Of course, we can thank God that the audiences are small, judging from the box-office records of W. P. A., which show a loss that would drive insane any ordinary theatrical producer.

A few years ago our colleague, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. HARRISON), speaking in the Senate on useless expenditures by the Federal Government, made one of the most entertaining speeches ever made in this Chamber, I believe. He read the titles of a mess of barnyard literature being issued by the Department of Agriculture. I recall that speech, which I read prior to the time I came to the United States Senate. My recollection is that it was in 1931. I recall that one bore the title "Love Life of a Bullfrog," but it did not have the label, "Written by and paid for with money from the pockets of the American taxpayer."

These putrid plays being presented by the W. P. A., Mr. President, are even more ludicrous than the booklets about which the Senator from Mississippi spoke. There is one great difference. The booklets were inane and comparatively harmless. All they did was to waste some of the money of the taxpayers. But that is not the case with the plays being presented by the W. P. A. theater project—plays that definitely bear the trade-mark of "red" Russia in their titles; plays that were spewed from the gutters of the Kremlin and directed by Communists, so that there could be no weakening of the ideas being spread through the American public. Let us take up a few, the kind that one would not find in the list of "shows you must see" in any reputable publication; the kind, however, that every Senator should see or study, so as to convince himself that the Communists mean business in their efforts to take over America by hook or crook, and are using to the fullest extent the funds of the American taxpayer to put themselves in a position to strangle the taxpayer when they have finished rifling his pockets.

Here is Up in Mabel's Room, which is comparatively clear. Then there is A New Deal for Mary, who probably needed some sort of deal, just as we need to deal out of the game such costs as keeping up with Mary's deal. Mother Goose Goes to Town is another. From looking at the losses of the W. P. A. theater project, I should say that Mother Goose had been sold down the river instead of going to town.

The only persons who have been going to town have been the Communists who are disguising their red pills with salacious coverings so as to lure, like a siren, all who can hear. The titles of the plays speak for themselves; and I judge that the only literature ever read by those in charge of the W. P. A. theater project was written by Boccaccio, or bore the name of Cassanova.

We will start off with The Mayor and the Manicure before going to see A New Kind of Love; and, if we are not careful, according to the W. P. A. play schedule, we can Be Sure Your Sex Will Find You Out. Then, after we are found out, we can be A Boudoir Diplomat, from which we can go to Cheating Husbands; and, once this palls, we probably might enjoy Companionate Maggie.

Of course, one play presented by the theater project might come under the heading of necessary historical, Biblical, and cultural research. That is the question posed in the title, Did Adam Sin?

Once we have settled this question, we might take in any of the following, or perhaps all of them if we chose, and round out the evening in a manner which, if we were to describe it on paper, might violate the postal regulations against obscene material:

Go Easy, Mabel; Just a Love Nest; Love 'Em and Leave 'Em; and then we have Mary's Other Husband by way of diversion.

I join my colleagues in saying that some of these titles perhaps may be a little bit misleading; but there is a side far more serious in the fact that through such material the cardinal keystone of communism—free love and racial equality—is being spread at the expense of the God-fearing, home-loving American taxpayer who must pay the bills for all this dangerous business.

Recently there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 7234, a lengthy statement showing that the directors of a W. P. A. theater project attempted to persuade an actress to have a date with a Negro who had visited the project. Mind you, this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those of you who desire to check up on it may find it on page 7234. One Trudy Goodrich, secretary of the "red-handed" Workers Alliance which has been issuing great floods of propaganda to prevent congressional elimination of the theater-project fund, told this actress:

I personally encourage Negro attention on all occasions, and go out with them—

Any time she was asked. Trudy, as an employee of the Workers Alliance, which fattens on the dues paid by relief employees from money received from the United States Treasury, is helping us spend whatever we appropriate for a theater project. Trudy told this girl who refused to go out with a Negro, and one of her supervisors named Harold Hecht said to her that the Negro was entitled just as much to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as was the girl. The girl, however, felt that she herself should choose what constituted the pursuit of happiness.

Do you think the American taxpayers would approve of our financing Trudy in her pursuit of happiness with whatever men of whatever color she might choose, under whatever condition and in whichever gutter might please her?

The Workers Alliance is functioning as the buzzard that picks the bones of the unfortunates on relief everywhere. But in the Federal theater project this communistic-controlled organization is even more active, because through the stage the propaganda of Stalin may be widely spread, and the American taxpayer pays the bill.

A few moments ago I mentioned the fact that the majority of the "actors" employed by the W. P. A. in its theater project were not really actors, but were amateurs trying to acquire some sort of status, or they were misfits and failures who had been unable to meet the rigid requirements of the profession for survival.

An investigation conducted by the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, and set forth in some detail on page 2682 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows that of some 12,000 theater workers some 50 percent, or 6,000, were qualified as actors by W. P. A. That is what our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] stated a moment ago. I desire to state again that I was delighted to have his contribution in reference to the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I believe the report shows that the proportion was about 50 percent, and that 50 percent I want to take care of. I know that the

senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] wants to take care of them, and so does the junior Senator from the State of California [Mr. DOWNEY]. I know that these Senators want to take care of those who are deserving of help, but I know that they do not want to take care of anybody who is preaching the overthrow of our Government, or who is not in sympathy with the form of government that we have.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WAGNER. I expect later to say a little more about this matter; but I desire again to call the attention of the Senator to a provision of the pending title which says that—

No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

That is an absolute prohibition against the payment of any compensation by W. P. A. to any person of the type to which the Senator refers. So absolute protection is provided against the employment by the United States on W. P. A. of any of these persons who preach communism, or who are believers in communism. What else can we do?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator from New York for calling that provision to my attention.

Mr. WAGNER. I am wondering whether we are to leave hungry and without employment the 7,000 men and women who are workers, who are stage hands in the theaters. I am going to say something about the plays a little later. One or two or three persons may have been guilty of subversive activities, but they have been cleaned out.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I desire to repeat, I do not want any real actor or artist or writer to go hungry, and I want to see that they are cared for, just like the bricklayer, or the mason, or the plumber, or the carpenter, or anyone else. But I am bringing these things to the attention of the Senate because I want the American people to know what has been going on in the Federal theater project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANAHY in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. REYNOLDS. O Mr. President, it was my understanding with the majority leader that the agreement would apply only after I had finished speaking. The majority leader came over and spoke to me and wanted to know if I would object to the agreement after I had finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will accept the statement of the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator from New York, for my information, whether the language which he just read describes a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know; but we were talking about those engaged in subversive activities in this country, and I assume that this is a definition which applies to the type of person who advocates the overthrow of the United States by force or violence. If there is any language which may improve or perhaps make more comprehensive this prohibition, I am quite willing to accept it. I am not the author of this language, but it was undoubtedly inserted to protect us against employing anyone who advocates any of these subversive doctrines.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have great respect for the Senator's opinion, and I am asking solely whether he would consider that membership in the Communist Party falls within the inhibition.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not thoroughly enough acquainted with the doctrines of the Communist Party in this country, but when we have been talking about Communists I think as a rule we are referring to those individuals who are advo-

cating the overthrow of our Government by force or violence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the course of his observations the Senator said that this applied to Communists, and I am trying to determine whether he would consider membership in the Communist Party as being within the inhibition.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not an authority upon the subject of Communists at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator from New York has stated in regard to the oath, I desire again to bring to the attention of the Senate a communistic publication, one article entitled "Politics in W. P. A." This is from the pen of Mr. George Morris. Mr. Morris says:

The much-referred-to oath that workers on W. P. A. would be required to take, a section in the bill apparently intended for face saving to WOODRUM and his friends, makes the whole affair still more ridiculous. Communists will surely take that oath and take it with genuine sincerity. In the oath the worker will swear to defend the Constitution "against all enemies, foreign and domestic"; and state that this obligation is taken "freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion," and that the duties on W. P. A. will be "faithfully discharged."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. This was brought to my attention by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLZ]. It appears in the magazine called "National Issues," for July 1939, and this is the first time I have ever seen a copy of it. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I wish to correct the Senator to this extent. At the time I read from the bill I was not referring particularly to the oath that was required to be taken, although that is also a protection, but I was referring to an absolute prohibition in the joint resolution against paying anyone any compensation out of the funds here provided who advocates, or is a member of an organization which advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence. So, in addition to the taking of the oath, there is the absolute direction to those administering the fund that they cannot pay any of the money appropriated to anyone who entertains any such subversive doctrines. Therefore, there is a double-barreled protection. If the Senator can propose anything else to cover the matter, I should be glad to have him do so.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Irrespective of whether the plays about which the Senator has been reading teach communistic doctrines or not, I am wondering, if we are to spend our money to provide labor for unemployed artists—and I am in favor of the idea of taking care of the unemployed actors and actresses in this way—whether we are not overlooking one thing which we really have an obligation to look after. We are spending the people's money, and apparently a good many of these plays, if they do not teach communism, teach anything but morality. It is the people's money we are spending. Whose business is it, if we spend the money in this way, to see that that money is spent so that the morale of this country shall not be shot to pieces?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is the business of the Director of the W. P. A.

Mr. WILEY. Then why should we not put our finger there and say, "Hereafter when you spend that money you will spend it in such and such a way or you shall not get the money for that purpose?"

Mr. REYNOLDS. Why should we not designate someone to pass upon the plays?

Mr. WILEY. I have just seen a list of the plays, which was exhibited to me by the Senator from West Virginia, and they are supplemental to what the Senator has already read into the RECORD. An examination of them indicates that the plays are very malodorous. America's money should not be used to encourage such productions.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much for that contribution.

Mr. President, the Equity Association, the actors' union, has a total membership of only 4,500, and I dare say they are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I stated a moment ago that the American Federation of Labor does not have any Communists in it. They will not stand for Communists in their organization. The American Legion was mentioned by the junior Senator from New York. We all know that the American Legion has been fighting communism, as we find the Veterans of Foreign Wars fighting it. The American Federation of Labor, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are the three outstanding organizations, amongst others, which are fighting all the time the spread of communism.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator knows that the American Federation of Labor is strongly supporting the amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, yes; I understand that, and I say that there are no Communists belonging to the American Federation of Labor. I am with the American Federation of Labor in its effort to support actors who belong to their union, but I am not willing to support Communists and those affiliated with the Workers Alliance, who are in this.

By the way, I wonder whether the Senator would accept an amendment to the paragraph carrying the prohibition relative to those who should receive pay, that any one who has ever been affiliated with the Workers Alliance, or who is now affiliated with the Workers Alliance, will be barred from participation. I wonder if that would be accepted. I ask that it be accepted as a part of the amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. I suggest that the Senator offer it as a separate amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would have it apply to anyone who has belonged or belongs now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will wait until the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] returns to the Chamber.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I hope the Senator from Colorado will accept the amendment. I am sure he will because everyone knows that the Workers Alliance is a part and portion of the Communist Party in this country.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I wonder whether it would help any from the Senator's point of view with respect to the Communists to whom he refers, if we inserted in line 21, page 24, the phrase "or as a worker." At present the language reads:

No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position—

And so forth. At that point I would add "or as a worker on any project." Would not that help?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Who advocates the overthrow of the Government?

Mr. LEE. No; make him take the oath the same as those who work in administrative or supervisory positions—make the provision as to taking the oath apply to the workers as well.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think it should apply to them, and I shall be very glad if the Senator from Oklahoma will offer such an amendment.

Mr. President, I see in the Chamber now the able senior Senator from Colorado, and I will say for his information that we were discussing the matter of those affiliated with the Federal theater project. The able Senator from New York has brought to my attention again the matter of the oath which has to be taken by those securing employment with the W. P. A. I mentioned the fact that the Workers Alliance seems to be in control of this project, and everyone knows that the Workers Alliance is in alliance with the Communist Party, and I wondered whether the Senator from Colorado would be good enough, in the interest of the American people and the taxpayers, to accept an amendment providing that anyone who has ever been affiliated with the Workers Alliance or who is affiliated with the Workers Alliance be barred from participating in the W. P. A. theater project.

Mr. ADAMS. No, Mr. President, I would not, because, while there may be Communists in the Workers Alliance, I

would not be willing to join in condemnation of everyone who belongs to that association, because there are many in it who do not come within that characterization.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I know hundreds of people in the State of Indiana who belong to the Workers Alliance who do not know that there is such a thing as the Communist Party.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I know a great many people who belong to the Workers Alliance, and I have never seen or heard of one who has not heard of the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, I do not know of anyone in the United States who has not heard of the Communist Party. I know there is no one in North Carolina who has not heard of the Communist Party, because the North Carolina people are well read and up and doing about everything. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, to repeat, the Equity Association, the actors union, has a total membership of only 4,500 and requires that to be a member the applicant must have had at least 2 years on the professional stage.

It would seem as though groups of young people who are eligible or partly eligible for relief were told to register as actors and were given salaries by the Federal theater. This amazing discrepancy between acting and actors probably is attributable to Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, director of the Federal theater project, and who formerly was connected with the drama department of Vassar College. I doubt that Mrs. Flanagan has ever had any real experience in the cold practicalities of presenting dramatic productions.

This would be indicated by the fact that the W. P. A. theater even hires understudies for actors who even have nothing to say in a play—the actors who make the noises off stage, and so on. Not satisfied with these extras, the W. P. A. theater project gives its actors vacations with pay at the rate of 2½ days' vacation for each month of work. That is more than the Federal Government gives its regular employees and considerably more than private industry can afford to give.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator was speaking about his amendment providing that anyone who belonged to the Workers Alliance should not be permitted to obtain relief. I have no doubt that there are some of the leaders of the Workers Alliance who belong to the Communist Party, but, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has pointed out, there are thousands of people, there are thousands in my State, who belong to the Workers Alliance—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Who are not affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. WHEELER. Who are not Communists.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is no doubt true.

Mr. WHEELER. Who would not in any sense join the Communist Party. Frankly, I rather doubt the wisdom of inserting a provision in reference to taking the oath before a man can get relief. I do not like the idea of saying to a man, "You have to take an oath and swear allegiance to the United States before you can get a little pittance or get on relief."

I think the committee really went too far.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, the Senator knows that some of the outstanding leaders in the Workers Alliance are Communists, and members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no doubt of that. I know that some of the leaders of the Workers Alliance in Montana belong to the Communist Party, and openly admit they do.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Nevertheless, it seems to me a man ought not to be discriminated against simply because he belongs to the Workers Alliance. The Senator from North Carolina a moment ago said that no Communist belongs to the American Federation of Labor. Let me say that Communists will be found in the American Federation of Labor, to my certain knowledge. I have known of Communists belonging to the A. F. of L.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator does not mean to infer that the American Federation of Labor will knowingly admit Communists to its ranks,

Mr. WHEELER. No; but, as a matter of fact, Communists may be found in all sorts of organizations. The organizations cannot be condemned simply for that reason. Communists will be found among the Masons, among the Knights of Columbus, in patriotic organizations, and in churches; but we cannot condemn a church or any organization simply because there may be some bad people in them. We cannot condemn fraternal and patriotic organizations simply because some bad persons belong to them. Good people and bad people are found in every walk of life.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say in that connection that I condemn the Communist Party regardless of the fact that there are some good people in it.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but when the Senator says that persons are all Communists simply because they belong to the Workers Alliance I think he is mistaken.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say that I know many persons who belong to the Workers Alliance who are not identified with the Communist Party.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the Senator that some of the things that the W. P. A. has permitted the theaters to produce are idiotic and have brought discredit upon the W. P. A. I say that when the W. P. A. permits persons to ridicule certain Senators, as they have done, so I have been told, and ridicule other public officials, that is a very silly and a very foolish thing for them to do. Notwithstanding the fact that they may have ridiculed some of our colleagues, or have ridiculed the courts, I must say that I believe that is no reason why we should deny relief to needy persons. What we ought to do is to hold responsible those who permit money to be spent for such purposes. I condemn the heads who are responsible for permitting such things to be done. I do not know who is responsible for it, whether it is the head of the W. P. A. in Washington, the head of the W. P. A. in New York, or the head of the W. P. A. somewhere else. Whoever permits such things to occur should be held strictly responsible. In the first place, it is not the right thing to do. In the second place, it is a very short-sighted policy. I do not wish to go so far as to keep persons from obtaining such work simply because there may be some fools belonging to the organization.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I may say to the Senator from Montana that I assume that he has read in virtually every magazine in the country and virtually every daily and weekly newspaper criticism of the W. P. A. theater project. And may I say to the Senator that I likewise will go further in assuming that these newspapers and magazines, many of them, have condemned the W. P. A. theater project because of the fact as they allege, that it was spreading communistic propaganda. What I am trying to do is to get those who are spreading communism in the theater project out of it. I say that those who are responsible for the spread of communism thus far through the instrumentality of the various avenues of the W. P. A. theater project should be discharged. They should not any longer be permitted to direct the activities of the W. P. A.

Mr. WHEELER. I am entirely in accord with the Senator in believing that those directing the W. P. A. theater project in whatever community, whether at the top here in Washington or in various cities, who permit such things to continue, should be held responsible. They may not necessarily encourage the spread of communism, but if they permit such things, and are spreading communism and using public funds to do so, then they ought to be discharged from the job.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I yield to the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator just a few moments ago read the name of a young woman. I have met that young lady but once. She is a graduate of Vassar. Her name is Mrs. Flanagan. The able Senator from North Carolina used her name in his manuscript. I wish to say that from my very brief visit in my office with this young woman I would testify, if I were required to under oath, that she is a loyal upstanding American citizen of the very highest type. I regret exceedingly that her name should

have been brought into this discussion in such a way as to be at all denounced in connection with communism.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, evidently the junior Senator from Nevada was not in the Senate Chamber when I made mention of Mrs. Flanagan's name. I want to go back and read what I said to the Senator. There is no reflection made upon her whatever. I never even mentioned Mrs. Flanagan in connection with communism. I wish to repeat exactly what I stated:

Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, director of the Federal theater project, and who formerly was connected with the drama department of Vassar College. I doubt that Mrs. Flanagan has ever had any real experience in the cold practicalities of presenting dramatic productions.

I made that statement because the information I have is that Mrs. Flanagan was the head of the department of dramatics at Vassar College, but never was connected with the legitimate theater itself outside the college.

I would have the Senators know that I have not reflected upon Mrs. Flanagan, and I would not think of reflecting upon her. Mrs. Flanagan is well known. She is a lady of the very highest type. There is no finer woman in America than is Mrs. Flanagan. That is all I said. I did not mean to infer that she was a Communist. I said that the only experience she had, insofar as I could learn, was that she had been at the head of the department of dramatics at Vassar College.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. If Mrs. Flanagan is interested in those who are in this particular art, to which she has given all her life work, if she is interested to the extent that she wants them to have a living in their particular inclination, in their particular bent in life, then I say that the mere fact that she was never herself a star nor assumed to be a star, nor went on the professional stage, should not be a matter of criticism.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am going to take issue with the Senator right there, Mr. President. I think that those who are in charge of the theater project should be sufficiently experienced to handle the matter in the way it should be handled. Let us read the statistics in reference to the Federal theater project, and we find that it has not been at all successful.

So far as the business management of the W. P. A. theater project is concerned, no one will deny that it is terrible. I did not attend any of the meetings of the committee. I did not read all of the hearings, but I read a part of them last night. In the investigation by the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives we find that W. P. A. projects were in rehearsal for from anywhere from 3 months to 2 years. Months and years in which terrific costs were being piled up, whereas the average theatrical production, according to qualified experts, is seldom in rehearsal more than 4 or 5 weeks, in which time the play is made ready for public appearance.

I say that there has been mismanagement. We ought to have had people at the head of the W. P. A. theater project who had had practical experience in the field. That is the trouble about many things that are going on today. We are getting many persons from colleges that have never had any practical experience. It would have been better had we taken some person with old-fashioned common horse sense.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, Representative DEMPSEY, in speaking of the director of the theater project, recently said:

In connection with the Federal theater project the Dies committee investigated that situation very thoroughly. So far as the director of that project is concerned, she came voluntarily to the committee and gave us free, clear testimony. She is not a Communist nor a "fellow traveler." She is a highly efficient, splendid American woman.

This testimony is amply borne out by the record of background and attainments of the national director, a director for 10 years of a theater which became famous here and abroad for its imaginative productions of both the classic and new plays; the winner of the first Guggenheim scholarship ever awarded to a woman; sent by this foundation to make a study of government in relation to theaters in 12 different European countries.

Mr. President, this distinguished woman is Mrs. Flanagan, who has undoubtedly had much valuable experience and

apparently has all the qualifications necessary to enable her to perform her official duties in a most satisfactory manner.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, of whom is the Senator speaking?

Mr. NEELY. Mrs. Flanagan.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Please, I want the Senator to understand, and I am sure the Senator would not leave the wrong impression so far as my attitude is concerned. I have not reflected upon the character of Mrs. Flanagan. She is a lady of the finest character. I am only making mention of the fact that she never had any practical experience, judging from the report of the committee who made the examination.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, what I have said was submitted for the purpose of refuting the insinuation that the management of the theater project is tainted with communism—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have not even suggested to the slightest degree that Mrs. Flanagan is in sympathy with communism. I do not want to leave a false impression.

Mr. NEELY. I did not mean to charge the eloquent Senator with having accused Miss Flanagan of being a Communist.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have the highest respect for Mrs. Flanagan, and there is no lady in all America of higher character than Mrs. Flanagan. I say only that from the investigation made it was found that there has been mismanagement in the W. P. A.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, what I read tends to prove that Mrs. Flanagan is entitled to all the compliments that have been paid her both by the Senator from North Carolina and by the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in all of which I enthusiastically concur. It also demonstrates the fact that she is eminently qualified to perform the important duties of the office which she now holds. The efficient Mrs. Flanagan constitutes one of the many unanswerable arguments in favor of the adoption of the pending amendment, proposed by Senators WAGNER, DOWNEY, and PEPPER, for which my vote will be cast.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I was present in the committee room when Mrs. Flanagan appeared and gave testimony in support of the theater project. I have also talked to many of the theatrical people who are interested in the maintenance of this project. My understanding is that Mrs. Flanagan is regarded by all of them as a lady of outstanding ability in the theatrical profession. That she has been trained and has a knowledge of the theatrical work these people are doing beyond anyone else who could possibly have been obtained for that position.

There is much misrepresentation with reference to the program they have been carrying out. Tonight on the floor of the Senate a paragraph was read from a play which purported to have been given by the theater project in which the spokesman was supposed to be advocating communism. As a matter of fact, that was a play that was produced at Vassar College. I have before me a statement with reference to it. A single sentence was picked out which created the impression that the whole purport of the play was to advocate communism, whereas if the play had been read further it would have appeared that the purpose of the play was to bring out the subject and to prove that communism was a bad thing for the country, and that the proper course for Americans to follow was good, patriotic, democratic principles.

Here are other sentences from the same play, which I should like to read into the Record, in reply to what was read from the floor of the Senate a short time ago.

FRANK. What do you want us to do? Have a revolution, like in Russia?

WARDELL. No, Frank; that's just what Davis and I want to prevent.

DRDLA. What did the revolution do for Russia? Once people laughed in the fields. Everyone was gay. Now, people are hungry there. No one laughs any more.

ANNE. This is the United States of America we live in, and we got a President and a Congress and a Government to look after our interests, and I want my boys should respect that Government and know that that Government ain't goin' to let us down.

So, if one reads the play in its entirety, it is obvious that the whole purport of the play was to denounce communism rather than to support it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? What I have to say deals with what the Senator from Montana has said.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Montana says that I was the one who put the material into the Record. He said that I said it was a W. P. A. project. I said no such thing. I said it was a play by Mrs. Flanagan which was read by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that he also has not read the play, but it was sent in to him in order that he might try to correct it.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Pennsylvania says that the hero of the play was a Communist. I have not read the play. All I said was what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said about it, that it was a W. P. A. project.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield in order that I may answer the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My time is rather limited.

Mr. MURRAY. As a matter of fact, all the theatrical newspapers of the country which commented on the play have supported it as a good play, and have said that it was not a play advocating communism. The book which I have here quotes from the New York World Telegram, from the Theater Guild magazine, the Austin Post, and the Theater Arts, showing that the play is not at all a play advocating communism, and that even though it was written by Mrs. Flanagan, it was a good sound American play.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. A few moments ago the inference was made that this group had not made a very substantial return; that is, the contribution which this group has made was referred to as being very meager. I happened to come into the Chamber at that time. I have before me a copy of the New York Times for Sunday, May 28, 1939, containing an article by Brooks Atkinson, probably the leading theatrical critic of the country, and certainly reporting in one of the most outstanding newspapers of the country. He says:

Two million six hundred thousand people are employed on W. P. A. projects throughout the country. Only 8,040 of them are employed in the Federal theater, between one-third and one-quarter of 1 percent. Among the 2,600,000 it would be hard to find another group of 8,040 that has accomplished so much and given so rich a social return on the money.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I shall not at this hour attempt to give my colleagues all the statistics which are available in the document I have before me, the record of hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations under House Resolution 130, part 1, pages 179, 276, 997, 1013, 1067, and 1115. These statistics show the tremendous wastes and extravagances of the theater project, which aggregated a cost of \$5,000,000 from July 1938 to May 1939.

The Senator from New York has just brought to the attention of the Senate and of all those on the W. P. A. throughout the length and breadth of the land that, according to the records, between July of 1938 and May 1939 only 8,040 persons were employed in the Federal theater. They cost the taxpayers of the country more than \$5,000,000. That being the case, they cost about 100 times more than the cost of maintaining the same number of men on any other W. P. A. project in this country. We can truly say, in the language of the theater, that Uncle Sam has been an "angel." When it is not known whether or not a show is going to be a success, the financial backer is called an "angel."

Approximately 99.99 percent of this expenditure was a dead loss, as the box-office receipts were virtually nothing.

Incidentally, a tremendous portion of the expenditure went for rental of theaters in which to present these so-called dramatic productions. For example, as indicative of the percentages found throughout all the individual presentations, one example shows rent of \$8,156, telephone \$2,866, miscellaneous \$2,715, travel \$589.

The record of the House committee hearing was filled with evidence of waste, such as purchasing 9,000 feet of a very expensive lighting cable for one play and leaving idle in another theater 7,000 feet of the same kind of cable.

I have my doubt as to the necessity of some of these people working on a W. P. A. project of any kind, such as Mrs. Audrey McMahon, who was the head of the art project in New York City. Mrs. Audrey McMahon was paid \$300 a month. In addition, her husband was a professor at New York University. She is also the editor of a magazine. That good lady, a lady of excellent character and fine attainments and social standing, whose husband was a professor at the University of New York, and who was the editor of a magazine, was receiving \$300 a month. I thought W. P. A. projects were for the purpose of helping people who did not have any money and could not get a job. At one time Mrs. McMahon made a trip from New York to a number of cities in the North and Middle West, costing \$203 in mileage alone, paid by W. P. A. travel voucher; and the sole purpose of the trip was to stir up protests against reducing appropriations for the W. P. A.

Mr. President, I have previously referred to the fact that one actress was informed she should have gone out to supper to encourage the pursuit of happiness by a Negro, as indicative of some of the things that go on in the W. P. A. theater project. The investigation to which I have referred gives the record of play after play in which the theater project used a mixed cast of whites and Negroes, a practice never followed in the legitimate theater for reasons we can all understand.

I now again refer to the Workers Alliance, a witness of which, Mr. Charles B. Walton, in the theatrical business since 1907, stated before the House committee that—

The Workers Alliance have absolutely dominated the Federal theater, and the present set-up, in my estimation, is nothing more or less than a very clever fence to sow the seeds of communism.

That is what Mr. Charles Walton said in giving testimony before the House committee. That statement is not mine, Mr. President.

Remember that a play by Voltaire caused the French Revolution. That is why the Communists have "muscle" into the theater project until they now control it, from all I can understand. From statements I have heard this afternoon there is no such thing as communism in the Federal theater project. I hope there is not.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to another thing of interest concerning the Federal theater project, and that is that the W. P. A. theater project and the Communist headquarters are in the same building. The Workers Alliance functions from the same building. There can be no doubt about the communistic control of the Workers Alliance, as the records of the Department of Justice show members of the executive board to be members of the Communist Party of America, as I stated a moment ago in reply to the statement of the senior Senator from Montana.

There is no doubt furthermore of the far-reaching campaign of the Communists through the Workers Alliance to spread their alien doctrines of ruin and destruction, their antichrist ideology by means of the theater project of the United States Government's Works Progress Administration.

Courses in Russian language were given in quarters donated by the Workers Alliance. Why should anybody be willing to spend money to spread knowledge of the Russian language in a country that has spoken English since its foundation? Why should the W. P. A. permit this to be done and why should the W. P. A. accept such services and facilities when offered by the Workers Alliance and anybody else?

Why should the Workers Alliance and other organizations of similar nature buy huge blocks of tickets to W. P. A. the-

ater plays—and buy them at a discount of from 30 to 40 percent less than the regular box-office price? The tickets were then sold by these organizations at a profit—so we find the W. P. A. theater project financing organizations dedicated to tearing down the American Government.

Mr. President, in the theater business the glass roof over the entrance to a theater and which contains the names of the play and the stars is called the marquee. On the strength of the record established by the theater projects of the W. P. A. the only lights for which there has been any demand in the past for use on W. P. A. theater marquees are red. Rather than try to make them white, Mr. President, we should eliminate the lights entirely, the marquee entirely, and the Federal theater project entirely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in connection with my remarks an extract from remarks delivered in the House of Representatives on June 15, 1939, by the gentleman from Michigan, Representative HOFFMAN, and found on pages 7234 and 7235 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. HOFFMAN. * * * Let me quote for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and for the benefit of the House the sworn testimony given on the 20th day of August 1938 before the Dies committee, under oath.

Miss Sallie Saunders, born in Vienna, Austria, a citizen of the United States since 1920, a resident of New York City since 1930, and an employee since March 3, 1936, with the exception of 90 days when she was on leave of absence, of the Federal theater project as an actress, testified, among other things, to the following, and I quote from her testimony, beginning on page 858, volume I, of the hearings:

"The CHAIRMAN. You are on the project now?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is the work that you are doing now?

"Miss SAUNDERS. As an actress.

"The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen with your eyes evidence of communistic or subversive activities on this particular project?

"Miss SAUNDERS. I can only say that literature has been sent around to me personally.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that Communist literature has been distributed on the premises?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Surely.

"The CHAIRMAN. On one occasion you were called on the telephone. Will you go into the details of that without going too much into it?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir. On Decoration Day I received a phone call from Mr. Van Cleave.

"The CHAIRMAN. This year?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir; and he asked me for a date. I lived at the Fraternity Club, and there are a great many men there. I thought it was someone I met at the Fraternity Club. I said, 'Mr. Van Cleave, I do not remember you; when did I meet you?' He said, 'I was the gentleman who sketched you in Sing for Your Supper.' I said, 'There were 289 people down there, and I do not know more than 25 of them.' He said, 'I am the fellow who was sketching you.' The day before I had noticed a Negro making a sketch of me as I was dancing. He shoved the sketch in my face. I did not know his name and did not know anything about him. All I knew was that a Negro had sketched me. I signed out and left the building. At first I thought it was someone trying to play a joke on me, and I became very angry about it and asked how he got my telephone number. He said that he took it from a petition blank, or a petition to President Roosevelt which we all signed regarding the \$1,000 pay cut. He took my name and address from that petition.

"Mr. MOSIER. How did he know that was your address?

"Miss SAUNDERS. He was one of the committee passing it around.

"The CHAIRMAN. After that time, when he asked permission to make a date with you, did you report it to the supervisor?

"Miss SAUNDERS. I reported it to Mr. Hecht.

"The CHAIRMAN. What did Mr. Hecht say to you?

"Miss SAUNDERS. He said, 'Sallie, I am surprised at you. He has just as much right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness as you have.' He said, 'It is in the Constitution.' I said, 'Mr. Hecht, that happens to be in the preamble to the Constitution.'

"The CHAIRMAN. Let us not go into that. We know there is feeling in the matter, and we have to be very cautious about race feelings. You reported it to him, and he advised you, in effect, that he was in favor of social equality?

"Miss SAUNDERS. According to the Constitution, and there was some press clipping about equal social rights.

"The CHAIRMAN. Did you report it to anyone else?

"Miss SAUNDERS. I talked it over with Miss Coonan, and she was appalled. I requested for an immediate transfer, which was granted. I then reported the matter through a personal friend to Senator PAT HARRISON.

"The CHAIRMAN. Who was Mr. Hecht?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Mr. Hecht is in Sing for Your Supper.

"The CHAIRMAN. An employee of the Federal project?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. I think that is far enough. Is he connected with the Workers Alliance?"

"Miss SAUNDERS. Mr. Hecht is of split nationality. He has a card in every organization which has the most power at the moment."

"Mr. MOSIER. What is his full name?"

"Miss SAUNDERS. Harold Hecht."

"The CHAIRMAN. Did you report it to Trudy Goodrich?"

"Miss SAUNDERS. She is a secretary of a Workers Alliance division, and she came to me of her own accord. She said she felt very sorry that I felt that way about it, because she personally encouraged Negro attention on all occasions and went out with them or with any Negro who asked her to."

"Mr. STARNES. Did she say that it was the policy of the Workers Alliance to do that?"

"Miss SAUNDERS. She did not say that; but she is a representative of that party, and they hobnob indiscriminately with them, throwing parties with them right and left."

"Mr. STARNES. Is that a part of the Communist program?"

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir; social equality and race merging."

"The CHAIRMAN. I think that is all. I thank you for your testimony."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to occupy about 10 minutes, but do not wish to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator, with the understanding we have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not know what understandings may have been entered into.

Mr. ASHURST. I have no understanding, Mr. President. I am asking the Senator to yield to me.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield the floor to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized in his own right. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to speak on the bill or the amendment?

Mr. ASHURST. On the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall not require half that time.

Mr. President, much has been said here today about communism; and all Senators will appreciate the earnestness with which learned Senators have addressed themselves to the subject of communism. If a bill using the word "Communist" or the word "communism" should be passed by the Congress and should be signed by the President, the courts, in construing it, would have recourse to the dictionary to see what Congress meant by "communism." I now quote from Webster's New International Dictionary, published in 1927, the definition of communism.

Communism: A system of social organizations in which goods are held in common, the opposite of a system of private property.

That is one definition.

2. A system of social organization where large powers are given to small political units or to communes; communalism.

3. Any theory or system of social organization involving common ownership of the agents of production and some approach to equality in the distribution of the products of industry. Informally, socialism.

Next, the definition of "Communist."

One who believes in communism in any of the first three senses named, or attempts to put its principles into practice.

Therefore, we may fairly say a Communist is a person who is devoted to, or is propagating, the theory of extirpating and doing away with the right of men to hold property, and is maintaining the principle that all property shall be held in common. I see before me the learned Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would adorn the Supreme Bench of the United States. I am quite sure if he were handing down an opinion he would say that what I have suggested is a fair definition of "Communist" and "communism."

Why, indeed, are the people of the United States so much opposed to communism? There is in an American an inborn, ineradicable, and sometimes inexplicable fear and dread of communism. No man in America is more opposed to communism, as I understand it, than am I, for the reason that communism would deprive an American citizen of what I believe to be one of his most precious rights, to wit, the right to hold property.

When the 10 amendments to the Constitution, called the Bill of Rights, were adopted, they set up, mark you, certain

rights which inhere in all men, which belong to freemen. Even if they were not enumerated in any Bill of Rights, these rights and immunities would be a part of the liberty of a free person. The fifth amendment provides:

No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Further, in order to protect what I call a great human right, the right to hold property, the seventh amendment provides:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.

It is provided in the fourteenth amendment:

Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

These provisions indicate that those who laid the foundations of American liberty realized that the right to acquire and hold property, large and small, the right to own a home, a farm, and to earn wages, was as dear as the right to jury trial, free speech, and the right to freedom of religion.

Indeed, of what avail would be jury trial, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion if this other great immunity, to wit, the right to earn wages and acquire property, which adds to the dignity of a human being, did not inhere in the free citizen?

I should not care a fig for a government which, forsooth, granted freedom of speech, and yet ironically deprived men and women of that other great human right, the right to earn wages and to own property. That is the reason why so many earnest, upstanding, sincere American citizens are opposed to communism. They know that communism strikes at one of their vital rights. They know that communism strikes at what I believe to be an—

Mr. WALSH. Inalienable.

Mr. ASHURST. Inalienable—I thank the Senator from Massachusetts—an inalienable right.

A President of the United States more than 34 years ago, in a speech, said he "always put human rights above property rights." Property has no rights. Think of a President using language such as that, putting human rights above property rights. A human right is the right to acquire property. A slab of paving stone is an insensate piece of rock. It has no rights. The right of men to acquire and hold property, large and small, and the right of men to earn wages, is not a property right—it is a human right.

Having said this much with respect to my view of communism, I agree that no person should be employed by or subsisted by the United States, or paid from its Treasury, who would strike a blow at those great rights of citizens, to wit, the right of free speech, freedom of religion, trial by jury, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, and to dignify himself by earning wages and owning property. I am against the Communists because they seek to deprive American citizens of a right that is as important as any other human right—the right to hold property.

We should preclude from being employed at the public expense any person who seeks to deprive human beings of this great right, the right to earn wages and hold property. Therefore I shall support any motion which will prevent the payment of Federal money to any person who says he is opposed to this American, this human, right.

Now, as to the stage and the employment of certain artists, I shall support any reasonable sum which has for its purpose the employment of actors and artists. Some Senators fear or believe some actors or artists may have taught communism.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in appropriate phrase, said that the way to destroy communism is to draw it out into the public light and expose it to the public view; for when people learn by the exposure of this un-American thing, communism, what it really means and what it proposes to do, the American people will be against communism.

Citizens have a right under our form of government peaceably to advocate a system depriving you, sir, of the right of free speech. They have a right to advocate a law depriving you, sir, of your immunities as a free man. Citizens have a

right to advocate a system under which no man shall earn wages, and I oppose such a doctrine. Known to zoology are communal birds, birds that all occupy the same nest. In zoology there are communal or communistic birds. We have in America too many communistic birds. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. As I gather, the Senator is against communism. He is not in favor of paying any Communists from the Public Treasury.

Mr. ASHURST. Not from the Public Treasury.

Mr. REED. Unless they are artists?

Mr. ASHURST. No, sir; not at all. I would not employ at the public expense an artist who is a Communist.

Mr. REED. Perhaps I misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Arizona, whose attention was called to the fact that Communists had been employed and communism taught and communism spread, to which the Senator from Arizona is opposed, unless it is done by artists?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I would not employ at the public expense a Communist, but I would not be afraid to go and see an artist who was a Communist produce or act in a play. I am not afraid of any contingency of that kind, because I agree with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that only by exposing the folly of communism can we cope with it.

Mr. REED. May I impose on the Senator again?

Mr. ASHURST. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. REED. That is to say, communism shall not be taught unless it is through the theater projects?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not say that.

Mr. REED. But, if communism is taught and the doctrine of communism is spread through these W. P. A. theater projects, the Senator is in favor of continuing them?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I say now for the third time—and the Senator is too keen in intellect to fail to grasp what I say—that I do not want anyone paid from the Public Treasury, whether he be artist, mechanic, or what not, who teaches communism. If one wishes to employ a Communist privately, I have no objection. That is his right and his business. If a Communist, at his own expense, desires to write a play and produce it, he has that right. If a man wants to urge that we should no longer have free speech, that is his right; but I do not want him employed at the public expense.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I propose to limit myself to 10 minutes, but I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Merely for a question. I take it that if some one advocated a deprivation of the right of free speech, the Senator from Arizona would not be afraid to listen to him.

Mr. ASHURST. I would not be afraid to listen to him, because I believe I could answer him.

I now want to say a word about the stage. I am probably not competent fairly to discuss the stage because of my tremendous bias in its favor. My body and my brain, if any, are in the Senate, but my heart has from boyhood been in the keeping of those princes and princesses of the House of Thespia.

The stage artists, the screen artists, and the vaudeville artists hold the mirror up to nature, and only through them do we ever see ourselves as others see us.

On the stage and on the screen we see our weaknesses, foibles, and pretensions made plain and then corrected. On the stage and on the screen the richness of human experience is laid before us, and all that is beautiful, all that is tragic, and all that is mournful in man's destiny is clearly shown.

The penetrating skill, the Attic salt, and the humor of the screen artist and the stage artist expose the shams and frivolities of a particular epoch, and not infrequently teach a nation the way of truth.

The comedies of Shakespeare enriched England, softened the cruelties of his time, and gave seasonable advice and

admonition to monarch, to lords, and commons. There would have been no polished Elizabethan England except for Shakespeare.

Unnumbered thousands of our own generation have been charmed by the melodious airs and clever rhymes of the Gilbert and Sullivan light operas and the talent of those two gentlemen was so exceptional and their criticisms of official smugness and complacency were so deft and subtle that their productions were given audition and applause by the most prim and rigid of the mid-Victorians.

The drama is coextensive with the people and of all the arts, save music, it is probably the dearest to the human race. The stage is akin to poetry in that it is a great expression of human emotion. The stage is a vision of the romance inseparable from every human life; it is a magical place, breathing the inspiration of color and sound; a place for high thoughts, splendid truths, and beautiful words, for objects vividly observed and gorgeously imagined.

I hope the Senate will not go on record as censoring art. The stage is art. Art is truth, and in the final sum of worldly things, only art endures; the sculptures outlast the dynasty, the colors outlive Da Vinci, "the coin outlasts Tiberius."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] a while ago, I think in response to a question, stated that the 1 percent provided for in his amendment would provide approximately \$14,000,000 free from any local contribution. I find from an examination of his amendment that the 1 percent applies to the entire amount appropriated in the joint resolution, which is one billion seven hundred and some odd million dollars, which would mean that seventeen million and a fraction dollars would be exempted from any local contribution.

I appreciate fully, and I sympathize entirely with the position of the Senator from North Carolina, and I will say to him frankly that when we vote on the 1-percent provision, I shall support his amendment. But I am wondering whether the Senator would not agree to modify his amendment by making it one-half of 1 percent instead of 1 percent, which would provide about \$9,000,000 out of this fund, which would not have to be matched by any local contribution whatever. I have talked with Senators about it, and I think if the Senator could consistently accept such an amendment, it would facilitate the adoption of his amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should like to give the Senator from Kentucky some figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator asked me awhile ago if I had the figures regarding the total expenditures on these projects from July 1, 1938, to May 31, 1939, which is practically the past year, on the various art projects. The expenditures for the theater project amounted to \$9,947,000. The aggregate art project expenditures amounted to \$5,000,000, the expenditures on the writers project amounted to \$4,000,000, and on the historical records project \$5,668,000. So there was a total expenditure in these various art projects of \$35,503,000.

I am merely giving the figures so that the Senator can see the extent to which the half of 1 percent would go.

Mr. BARKLEY. When I asked the Senator for the figures I asked him for the 5-year period, and I understood him to reply that the amount expended for the theater, art, and writers projects amounted to a little less than \$40,000,000 for the 5-year period. Evidently that was a mistake.

Mr. ADAMS. I was in error, because the figures I have given are the exact tabulations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon the total amount of the appropriation to which this amendment is applicable, it would provide approximately seventeen and one-half million dollars instead of the fourteen million the Senator from New York suggested awhile ago.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes. Of course, I bow to the statement of the majority leader of the Senate; but when the proposal is made to reduce the amount to one-half of 1 percent,

I call attention to the fact that the expenditure was reduced last year for these different projects, not only for the theater project, as was pointed out by the Senator from Colorado, but also the art projects. So even 1 percent would be about half of what was expended last year upon these projects. If we further cut the amount, it will represent practically one-fourth of what was spent last year.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems that the crux of this proposition revolves around the theater project. I am wondering whether it would not be possible to have local communities make a contribution, if necessary, in regard to musical and art projects. The suggestion I am making would permit the W. P. A. to go ahead with the theater projects. I realize that while the theater and the musical and similar projects are all grouped together, it seems to me there is a difference between the theater projects and others which are local and which are more or less stationary. They are rather fixed to the locality, more so than is the theater project. I wonder whether, if the Senator should accede to that suggestion—and I am not pressing it, but I am making it after some discussion here informally—it would not be possible for the W. P. A. to carry out the theater project without serious impairment and at the same time probably receive some local contribution for the musical and art projects, which are more stationary and more fixed to sites than are the theater projects.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me suggest, Mr. President, that there are a number of groups—I understand from the Senator from Florida about five—and I suggest that we eliminate from the groups the musicians. I do not think the local communities ought to be called upon to provide any percentage of expenditure for the musicians. The musicians have been harder hit in this country than have any of the other groups. I am perfectly willing, insofar as I am individually concerned, to eliminate the musicians, because we all know that the musicians, as a matter of fact, have been hit harder than any other group. I think the musicians ought to be eliminated.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator does not mean "eliminated."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I mean they ought to be eliminated from this phase of the legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt the wisdom of undertaking to mention in the amendment any particular class. It will be largely in the discretion of the authorities who administer the provision whether nine million or seventeen and one-half million or eighteen million dollars will be exempt from the requirements of local contribution.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In respect to that, I am suggesting that we exempt the musicians from the making of any local contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt very much whether it would be wise to exempt anyone in the law itself.

Mr. WAGNER. Let me suggest to the Senator from Kentucky, who has been in such a kind way attempting to assist in this matter, that if the thought of the Senator from North Carolina should be carried out, and the musicians should be cared for as they have been in the past, that alone would require the expenditure of \$10,000,000. That was the expenditure last year for the musicians on W. P. A. So, if we will leave the 1 percent in the bill, as the amendment provides, and assume that reasonable care will be taken of the musicians, say by \$7,000,000, instead of \$10,000,000, we will be able to take care of the musicians as the Senator from North Carolina wishes to do, and have some money left—not so much as heretofore, but I am quite satisfied with that—and also take care of both the theater and the art projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is difficult to draw a distinction between actors and musicians and artists and sculptors. They all come in the same category. It is difficult to draw a line of distinction and say one shall be excluded and another included.

Mr. WAGNER. I was thinking of the total sum we would allow to be used for purely Federal projects. If we allow \$17,000,000, that will take care of the musicians and will take care of the theater and art projects, though not to the same extent, of course.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I think there is, perhaps, some confusion in this situation. What we are dealing with is a provision in the joint resolution which prohibits the use of any of these funds for the operation of projects sponsored solely by the Works Progress Administration. If we did not have another provision, any form of sponsorship relatively small would meet the requirements. The problem is that we now have a 25-percent provision in the joint resolution, so that sponsorship is only required to meet the 25 percent. The W. P. A. takes care of the 75 percent, in any event; that is, there is no occasion to talk about sponsoring to the extent of 50 percent, because it comes out of the same pocket. It is merely a matter of making a provision which will meet the limitation that there may be no projects which are solely sponsored by the W. P. A.

Mr. WAGNER. Except those—

Mr. ADAMS. There is no exception. This provision does not refer only to the art projects. Here is a flat provision that no projects may be constructed which are solely sponsored by the W. P. A., so that if we are thinking only in terms of these projects, we need only 25 percent of the projects which the Senator thinks should have Government help in sponsorship.

There may be other projects which might require sponsorship. The percentage provided is not tied down by the amendment, as I have read it, to the art projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator from New York and to the Senator from Colorado that under the provisions of the joint resolution requiring an average contribution of 25 percent in each State it will be possible for the W. P. A. Administrator to approve a project which requires only 1 percent of local contribution. Of course that would mean that some other project, probably a much larger one, would have to pay more than 25 percent, perhaps 30 or 35 percent. So that some of the artistic projects could still get by on a very nominal contribution.

It occurred to me, in view of the feeling I have been encountering, that if the Senator will make practically \$9,000,000 exempt from any local contribution at all, with the possibility of making only 1 percent contribution, or 2 percent, or 3 percent, for these similar projects, even under the 25-percent average, it probably would be possible to work out a much better situation than is possible under the joint resolution as it passed the House, which bars all of them from any consideration unless there is local contribution.

I make that suggestion to the Senator from New York. Of course, it is entirely in his discretion whether or not he will accept it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a word of comment, the mechanics of the matter are somewhat difficult, it seems, but the Senator would not think it fair if we reduced by 50 percent the appropriation which was made last year for the whole arts program?

Mr. BARKLEY. If we were considering that all by itself, that would be one thing, but here we have a joint resolution which eliminates altogether, according to the House text, any project altogether sponsored by the Federal Government. So that all theater, art, musical, and other projects of that character are out unless there is a local contribution.

In view of that situation, it occurred to me that it might be well to try to work out a fair average which might make it possible for some of the more important and more emergent categories to be considered without regard to a local contribution, having in mind the possibility that, even under the 25-percent average, it still would be possible to provide some of these projects with a very nominal contribution.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to say in reference to what our leader has just stated that I am exceedingly anxious to have the musicians taken care of as they were cared for last year. I suggest that it might be agreeable to this body to provide for the musicians of

America as we did last year without any reduced appropriation insofar as their benefits would be concerned, and that we reduce the appropriation for the Federal theater project by 50 percent. I think that would be agreeable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the amendment applies not only to theater projects, but to all sorts of artists and musical projects. The 1 percent applies to all of them. I doubt the wisdom from a legislative standpoint of mentioning any particular one of these as being exempt or included. I think we have to leave that for the Administrator to work out. I sympathize with the Senator from North Carolina in this matter, because, as the Senator from Arizona has suggested, I would not like to see Congress or this Government say to men or women engaged in music as a career, to men and women engaged in acting as a career, which have been recognized professions from time immemorial, that they shall be barred from consideration. I realize that because of the nature of their employment it is frequently impossible to work up any local contribution for them. I appreciate all that.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator. There is another reason. Many of the theater projects have produced plays in more than one State, and the question might arise as to what State ought to sponsor a particular project. That is the reason why it seems to me to be unfair to put them in a class where they will have to have a contribution of 25 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree, because the cost of production may have occurred in one State altogether, and if they go around to various States that might require that each State make a contribution of its proportional share of the original cost of production, which would be impracticable.

Mr. WAGNER. That is so with the musicians. I am sure that those who are lovers of music have heard the symphony concerts of the Federal projects orchestras. These musicians have been going around to different sections of the country where it was impossible to organize a local orchestra, and the country has received the benefit of great cultural advantages. I say it would also be difficult to call that a local project, because a number of States receive the benefit of the music. That is the reason I think they ought to be treated somewhat differently than the projects we were discussing under the 25-percent contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that. Can we make it three-quarters of 1 percent? I am not offering it as an amendment to the Senator's amendment, but I think three-quarters percent would probably be a fair compromise. That would amount to about twelve million or fourteen million dollars, which would be earmarked as not requiring any local contribution.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment as modified stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 23, inclusive, and to insert the following:

SEC. 25. After October 31, 1939, not more than three-fourths of 1 percent of the funds appropriated under this joint resolution shall be available for projects sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Kansas comes too late. The decision of the Chair was announced after a long pause.

Mr. REED. I beg the pardon of the Chair, but there were several requests for a division which the Chair perhaps did not hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there were any suggestions made, they were not sufficiently audible to be heard here in the chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 11, it is proposed to strike out all of section 15 and to insert in lieu thereof the following—

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that the amendment of the Senator from Nevada is not yet in order. It is an amendment to the House text.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understood that the committee amendments had been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not as yet been completed.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment, on page 38, line 24, which was passed over.

The amendment passed over was, on page 38, in line 24, after the word "establish", to insert "relocate", and on page 39, line 1, after the word "products", to insert "(other than those derived from the first processing of agricultural products)", so as to read:

SEC. 34. No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, or plants which would manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of agricultural products) in competition with existing industries.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I dislike very much to interrupt at this point, but I did intend to say something in answer to what the Senator from North Carolina said on the theater project, but I have had sufficient experience to know that there is a time when one should not speak.

I should like permission to insert in the RECORD the names of both individuals and organizations which have supported the amendment, and also a statement by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who, by the way, landed today in England in the *Yankee Clipper*. The Senator requested that there be printed in the RECORD the statement which he had prepared in support of the amendment in reference to the theater project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Senator CHAVEZ and the list presented by Senator WAGNER are as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ IN REFERENCE TO FEDERAL ARTS PROJECTS

Inasmuch as the House work-relief bill makes no provision for Federal-sponsored arts projects, I am leaving a live proxy with the Senate Appropriations Committee requesting that in the event that the subcommittee follows the House provisions in respect to this I have asked that my vote be recorded if an amendment is offered by the full committee in favor of Federal arts projects. I do this convinced that a careful and impartial study of what the Federal arts projects division of W. P. A. has done in the past will convince even the most biased of the tremendous cultural value of the accomplishment and further because of the need of the unfortunate persons who come under these types of projects which is equally as great as that of any other group in this Nation; and whose desire to live and work is quite as keen and should be just as respected as those of any other groups.

In New Mexico the work of the Federal arts projects has won the admiration and respect of all walks of life in every community. The artistic endeavors, I am told by authorities and persons competent to judge, rank with the very highest. Art which is termed "boondoggling" by prejudiced critics is welcomed and respected in New Mexico and I feel sure that the same condition exists all over this country. Theater projects in New Mexico have been enthusiastically supported by the communities. It is impossible to estimate the tremendous contribution which the writers project, for example, are making for the cultural advancement of the United States. I have in mind, for instance, a book which is now being prepared which has Nation-wide significance. The time when conflagration threatens in Europe and in the Orient and when the need of cementing closer relations with Latin America is so imperative anything which would benefit our relations with our neighbors to the south is not only helpful but an absolute necessity. The book which is being prepared by the Federal writers project is *Study of Spanish Speaking People of the United States: 1540-1940*. This book is the

epic of the oldest white inhabitants of our country, starting with the early Spanish settlements of the sixteenth century, and carrying the story down to the present time. The Spanish-speaking people are associated in the public mind with the Southwest. What is not so generally realized, and what is brought out clearly in this book, is that some of them migrated from the Mexican to the Canadian border and that they spread not only to the Pacific coast but as far east as New England and Florida.

The music, art, and historical records projects are cooperating with the writers project in the preparation of this study. It includes a detailed account of the Spanish-speaking people, and full treatment of their folklore, folk music, and folk art. With the exception of the Indians, the folk music of the Spanish-Americans of the Southwest has a longer history than that of any other racial group on our continent. Folk ways, folk songs, and folk games were brought in by the first hardy adventurers, and were handed down from generation to generation with comparatively little change.

All this material is being gathered together in the various State offices with the help of volunteer consultants from Spanish-speaking societies and from universities and colleges, and is being welded into a unified whole by the editors of the Washington staffs.

To my mind the success of pan-Americanism and of closer relations with Latin America is absolutely dependent upon an understanding by the citizens of the United States of Latin American philosophy and culture. We can find no better place to study this than in our own American Southwest, "The place where the Americas meet," to borrow a phrase coined by a very close friend and sponsor of pan-Americanism, Dr. F. M. Kercheville, of the University of New Mexico. This study which the Federal art project is in the process of making will develop information and material which will be helpful in promoting this understanding.

How then, can anyone call a study which is so necessary and so badly needed, "boondoggling" and "a waste of taxpayers' money"? The persons employed on such projects are needy and Congress has an equal responsibility to assist them as it has to other needy persons in the United States. This is only one of the many studies which the Federal arts project has under way.

I am leaving instructions that if there is a Senate vote on this that I be paired in favor of the amendment covering this point and I am asking that this statement be inserted in the Record.

EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT

Mr. WAGNER. The Federal art projects (Federal project No. 1) include the following five units: (1) the Federal music project, (2) the Federal writers project, (3) the Federal art project, (4) the Federal theater project, (5) the historical records survey.

Under the bill as now before the Senate, all of the music, theater, art, and writers projects, and the historical records survey, are required to obtain local sponsorship.

If the amendment is adopted, after October 31, 1939, not more than three-fourths of 1 percent of Federal relief funds appropriated in the bill will be available for projects sponsored solely by the W. P. A.

This means that over half of all these cultural projects will have to obtain local sponsorship by October 31. It also means that those phases of the music, theater, art, and writers projects which would be killed by the requirement of local sponsorship, can be continued under W. P. A. sponsorship. These include such important phases of the work as the music lessons for rural children, the traveling art shows, the traveling theater units, the books on regional subjects, such as the widely acclaimed Oregon Trail, Santa Fe Trail, guides to national parks, and many other regional projects.

Probably the most useful work done by the arts projects has been to bring music, painting, sculpture, drama, puppet shows, and literature to the remote rural areas of the country. People who would otherwise never see an oil painting or a wood cut, attend a musical concert or a legitimate-theater production have become acquainted with these arts for the first time through the W. P. A.

In short, the adoption of this amendment will enable those projects which obviously could not obtain local sponsorship to continue as W. P. A. Federal projects, while at the same time compelling all those which can operate under local sponsorship to be so transferred.

I want to emphasize that the attempt immediately to decentralize the arts projects cannot be justified on grounds of economy. The Federal Government contributes less in nonlabor costs to Federal project No. 1 than it does, for example, to the locally sponsored construction projects. The Federal contribution for nonlabor costs amounts to \$4.85

a month per person for Federal project No. 1 as compared with \$6 per person for all non-Federal projects.

It should also be noted that while the arts projects are now under technical Federal sponsorship, as a practical matter, through local participation in providing materials, space, services, admissions, and direct cash contributions, a high degree of local participation is obtained. Whereas local sponsors on all W. P. A. projects bear 53.8 percent of the non-labor costs, in many units under Federal project No. 1, all the non-labor costs are locally borne, and more than 50 percent of them are locally borne in a majority of the units.

For example, the publication costs of all but two of the 300 volumes published by the writers project have been borne locally. In some localities, the music project is and has been under practical local sponsorship for a considerable period of time; in Massachusetts, it has operated for 2 years without a cent of nonlabor cost to the Federal Government. In addition, this project has taken in receipts amounting to \$453,693, which, in addition to the sponsors' direct contributions, provides a high degree of local sponsorship.

The community art centers established by the art project are locally sponsored through the provision of space, light, heat, and other facilities. Of the 96,000 drawings, easel paintings, murals, and sculptured works produced by the project, a large number have been done for display in tax-supported buildings. The nonlabor costs of these works—principally the cost of materials—are borne by the city, county, or State requesting that they be done.

Finally, the theater project, like the music project, obtains substantial local sponsorship through admission charges. While more than 65 percent of its productions are free, admissions for the remainder have totaled \$2,291,000. Since January 1939, admissions have amounted to 10 percent of the total cost of the project, or enough to cover all the nonlabor costs. In addition, the project has received a variety of local contributions in kind.

To illustrate the wide diversity of this local sponsorship so far as the theater project is concerned, I have inserted at the end of my remarks a list of over 300 clubs, universities, charities, and other civic and religious bodies which have actively sponsored the project through the purchase of large blocks of tickets or other financial contributions.

EMPLOYMENT AND EXPENDITURES ON FEDERAL ART PROJECTS

In weighing the merits of the proposed amendment, it will be helpful to summarize briefly the employment provided and sums expended in connection with the Federal art projects.

The five projects have employed an average of 40,000 people for the past 3½ years; 32,577 persons were on the rolls as of June 14, 1939.

Since their inception in 1935, the Federal Government has expended \$136,053,221 on these projects, of which over 95 percent has been paid in wages. This sum has been distributed as follows:

Art.....	\$18,493,968
Music.....	46,120,073
Theater.....	43,349,121
Writers.....	15,739,516
Historical Records.....	12,350,543

For the fiscal year 1939, expenditures on the arts projects have been distributed as follows:

Art.....	\$5,532,095
Music.....	11,834,215
Theater.....	10,726,022
Writers.....	4,397,147
Historical Records.....	6,354,301
Total.....	38,843,780

As I have said, the average contribution by the Federal Government for nonlabor costs under Federal project No. 1 has been \$4.85 per month per person, in comparison with approximately \$6 per person under all other W. P. A. projects. In other words, these projects while under Federal sponsorship have cost the Government less in nonlabor costs than have the locally sponsored construction and other projects.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The accomplishments of Federal project No. 1 have been notable. In bare statistical terms alone its record is prodigious. As of June 30, 1938, it had produced the following:

Art:

Federal community art centers:	
Number established.....	53
Aggregate attendance.....	4,000,000
Drawings, easel paintings, murals, and sculptured works: Number.....	96,602
Etchings, lithographs, wood blocks, etc.: Number of originals.....	15,756
Number of prints.....	76,000
Arts and crafts: Number of objects made.....	43,000
Index of American design plates: Number of plates made.....	7,940
Stage sets, dioramas, and models for visual education: Number.....	10,610

Music:

Music classes (January 1938 through June 1938): Average monthly attendance.....	530,000
Music performances (month of June 1938): Number.....	4,355
Aggregate audience.....	3,030,000

Theater:

Theatrical productions: Number.....	1,813
Theatrical performances (January 1938 through June 1938): Average number per month.....	1,077
Average monthly attendance.....	476,000

Writing:

Number of books and pamphlets published.....	293
Number of copies distributed.....	3,550,000

Historical Records Survey:

Number of States whose records have been listed.....	8
Number of counties whose records have been listed.....	2,051
Number of county inventories published.....	168
Number of towns whose records have been listed.....	1,559
Number of town inventories published.....	14
Number of churches whose records have been listed.....	50,355

That much of the work is of unusual quality is apparent from a glance at some of the honors conferred on project employees. For example, James Newell was awarded the Architect League's gold medal in 1938 for his mural at Evander Childs High School in New York City, entitled "The Evolution of Western Civilization." This medal had not been awarded for 5 years because no work worthy of its award had been found. Three W. P. A. project sculptors took the first three awards in the 1938 Metropolitan Life Insurance competition. Each year several of the woodcuts, etchings, and lithographs done by W. P. A. project artists, are chosen for inclusion in the volume *Fine Prints of the Year*. In 1936, Artist Harry Sternberg won a Guggenheim fellowship.

The theater project, too, has done distinguished work. Its staff has included such well-known figures in the theater as Orson Welles, Alfred Kreymborg, Virgil Geddes, John Houseman, and others. Orson Welles and the Mercury Theater, which he heads, owe their start and success to this project, as attested by Mr. Welles himself. More than 2,650 former employees of the theater project have returned to private theaters or the movies.

Of the 94 productions on Broadway during the current season, 88 employed one or more former Federal theater workers. Four of the seven playwrights winning Rockefeller scholarships this year were formerly connected with the theater project, while Arthur Arent, author of the highly successful W. P. A. production *One Third of a Nation*, received a Guggenheim fellowship. Ardis Gaines, known to moviegoers as Brenda Marshall, was recruited by Warner Bros. directly from the cast of a Federal theater play for the feminine lead in *Career Man*. The experience of Gloria Dickson was similar.

Practically every major Hollywood studio employs former theater-project employees. Howard Bay, who designed the sets for Tallulah Bankhead's production of the *Little Foxes*, had previously designed the set for the Federal theater's production of *One Third of a Nation*.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a list of all the W. P. A. theater productions by title, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The director of the theater project has a distinguished record of service to the American theater. As director of the experimental theater at Grinnell College, her alma mater, as assistant to George Pierce Baker in the famous "47 Workshop" at Harvard and as director of the experimental theater at Vassar, her work attracted wide attention which led to her being awarded the first Guggenheim Fellowship ever conferred on a woman. Of the report of her work under the fellowship, the New York Times has stated that it is "the most intelligible and best proportioned account of the contemporary European theater now available in English."

She returned to Vassar after her fellowship work, from where she was called to Washington to head the theater project. The tremendous success of this phase of her work is attested to by drama critics, playwrights, producers, actors, and actresses the country over.

A similarly high record of achievement has been made by the other cultural projects. Formerly employed on the writers project were such well-known literary figures as John Steinbeck, author of *Of Mice and Men* and *Grapes of Wrath*, Conrad Aiken, Richard Wright, Vincent McHugh, and John Cheever.

Practically every symphony orchestra in the country contains one or more former W. P. A. music-project employees. The Boston Symphony Orchestra, for example, has 11 former project members, the National Broadcasting Co. Orchestra has several, as have the Pittsburgh Symphony, the National Symphony, and others. In addition, former W. P. A. musicians are now conductors of the Houston and Louisville Symphonies.

While this list of individual accomplishments is impressive in itself, the worth of these projects as a whole is demonstrated by the unanimity with which they have been approved by critics, artists, actors, writers, producers, musicians, and others eminently qualified to judge. Only last week, 12 of the outstanding New York dramatic critics said:

We declare that we have had many occasions to praise productions of the Federal theater in New York, many of which have been distinguished contributions to the art of the theater and others of which have been creditable in many respects.

Brooks Atkinson, dramatic critic, New York Times; Burns Mantle, dramatic critic, New York Daily News; Sidney Whipple, dramatic critic, New York World-Telegram; Allene Talmey, dramatic critic, the Vogue; Wolcott Gibbs, dramatic critic, New Yorker magazine; Otis Ferguson, dramatic critic, New Republic; John Gassner, dramatic critic, Forum magazine; Paul Peters, Life magazine; Joseph Wood Krutch, the Nation magazine; Mrs. Eurphemia Van Rensseler Wyatt, representative, the Catholic World; Kelcey Allen, Daily News Record and Women's Wear; Arthur Pollock, dramatic critic, Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

To the same effect was the following statement by 30 prominent actors, actresses, producers, and playwrights:

Its productions have given entertainment and education to millions of Americans and brought economic relief and moral regeneration to thousands of theater workers who faced destitution.

Helen Hayes, Eddie Cantor, Ben Bernie, George Abbott, Moss Hart, Lee Shubert, Arthur Schwartz, Burgess Meredith, Ethel Waters, Worthington Minor, Arthur Richman, Harold Clurman, Sam H. Harris, Clifford Odets, Richard Rogers, Laurence Langner, Philip Loeb, Katharine Cornell, Tallulah Bankhead, Katherine Hepburn, Blanche Yurka, Donald Ogden Stewart, Douglass Montgomery, Herman Shumlin, John Krimsky, Bela Blau, Laurette Taylor, Florence Reed, William Gaxton, and Victor Moore.

Brooks Atkinson, well-known theatrical critic, of the New York Times, wrote last month of the Federal theater project:

Two million six hundred thousand people are employed on W. P. A. projects throughout the country. Only 8,040 of them are employed in the Federal theater—between one-third and one-fourth of 1 percent. Among the 2,600,000 it would be hard to find another group of 8,040 that has accomplished so much and given so rich a social return on the money. * * * It has been the best friend the theater as an institution has ever had in this country.

The art project, too, has been highly lauded. Ford Madox Ford, prominent English critic and author, said of this project:

The level of the work is astonishingly high. Art in America is being given its chance and there has been nothing like it since before the Reformation.

The music project, too, has been highly praised. Erich Wolfgang Korngold, the Austrian conductor and composer, after hearing several W. P. A. music units, remarked:

Nowhere in Europe is there anything to compare with it. Of course, we have state-subsidized opera, but no country in Europe has anything to equal this.

Charles Wakefield Cadman, the celebrated American composer, has voiced his praise, as follows:

The Federal music project is the finest constructive force that has ever come into American musical life. * * * It is serving as a vital stimulating factor, not only in the immediate rehabilitation of musicians but in the perpetuation and furtherance of a high type of music which is so important to any nation's cultural and ethical progress. A vital musical evolution has taken place in every community it has reached.

The work of the writers project has been hailed by authors, editors, and publishers alike. On May 22, 1939, 44 publishers, including representatives of virtually all of the large publishing houses, such as Harcourt, Brace & Co., the Viking Press, Random House, Funk & Wagnells, Houghton Mifflin, Alfred A. Knopf, Bobbs-Merrill, and others, issued a statement praising the Federal writers project and urging that nothing be done to "hamper its program at this time."

On June 15, 50 authors, editors, and other literary figures, including Stephen Vincent Benet, Rockwell Kent, Burns Mantle, Louis Untermeyer, and Van Wyck Brooks, joined in a statement characterizing the work of the writers project as "one of the most significant literary records of the twentieth century."

Finally, Lewis Mumford, well-known literary critic, has said of the American guide series:

Of all the good uses of adversity, one of the best has been the inception and execution of a series of American guidebooks, the first attempt on a comprehensive scale to make the country itself worthily known to Americans. The best of the new guides that are so far available give one a great thrill of pride; pride of the country they describe and in the capacity and devotion and the fine anonymous collaboration which has gone into this work. These guidebooks are the finest contribution to American patriotism that has been made in our generation.

Mr. President, in the light of the distinguished record of the arts projects, their significant contribution to American culture, as well as their social and economic contribution to the unemployed artists, actors, writers, and musicians, I sincerely hope that the Senate will provide the comparatively insignificant sum authorized by this amendment for the Federal maintenance of those of the projects which cannot survive under a requirement of local sponsorship.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an eloquent and moving plea for the continuance of the Federal arts projects, delivered over the National Broadcasting System Monday evening by the distinguished actor, Mr. Lionel Barrymore:

RADIO ADDRESS BY LIONEL BARRYMORE

I have been in the theater a good many years. Acting is the only profession I know. I have been a pretty lucky actor, and don't think for a minute that an actor doesn't need plenty of luck. An actor is an odd sort of animal. If he's got any talent at all, he seems to feel that he ought to make his living by that talent. I am told that doctors and nurses and painters and sculptors all have kind of the same idea, because they like to make their living at what they are good at.

When this depression came along the theater was badly hit. That didn't stop the actors from wanting to keep on living, however. It didn't stop the stage hands and the electricians, and the ushers and the scrub women, from wanting to keep on living, too. Well, the Government recognized that fact. By golly, one day we found a special theater had been established, and those people went to working at it.

Now, the special theater was a little different from any we had ever seen. In the old tramping days our job used to be to get folks to the theater, and along came a modern, civilized idea: Let's take the theater to the people. So the Federal theater project was not limited to the big cities. The Government was saying, Why shouldn't the people that live in the little towns and villages, remote communities, that had never seen a play, have the advantage of getting acquainted with the great classics of poetry and drama? But what about the 26,000,000 people who have been benefited by seeing the Federal theater plays, and millions of others who have been finding education through its art projects? I think they would be kind of mad if they found they were going to go back to the humdrum world they had to live in before the Government came along to help them.

If I were a farmer, say, living down in the swamps of Florida, and my children had been taught to play the fiddle and paint a picture or sing a song, or watch theatrical productions, I don't know how I would answer them if they asked me why all these things were being taken away from them. Maybe I would want to ask my Congressman why this chance to improve themselves had been taken away from them, and he would have to have some pretty good answers if he wanted to satisfy me.

Yes, sir; as a farmer I think I would be pretty mad, and as an actor I know I would be as mad as I ever expect to be in my life if 8,000 men and women of my own kind, earning their living in a pretty tough world, were thrown out as though they weren't worth Congress' consideration.

Now, it is true, I am just an old actor talking, but I am also an old citizen of the United States and I bet you I could find a lot of people who feel just about the same way I do on this sort of thing. I think it is dangerous for a nation to start proving what a fine country it can be and then right in the middle of proving it let it slide back to the dark days of the depression. If I were a Congressman, I would try to remember that the American people never let anything be taken away from them permanently. Lately their own country has given them something else besides protective tariffs, good roads, good schools, and pellagra control. I hope Congress won't see fit to say, "Oh, all right; we will give them their old arts projects for a couple of months more." I hope they will realize that the help the Government has furnished in the last few years has become part of the daily life of the American people and part of their hope for the future, and taking it away would be almost like taking one of the stripes out of the American flag.

Now, you must not do that, and don't say, "Well, you can have it for a little while longer."

The Federal art projects are all part of America today and you ought not to fool with them at all.

PARTIAL LIST OF LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING FEDERAL THEATER PRODUCTIONS

Advertising Club of New York; Advertising Women of New York; Big Sisters Club; Business and Professional Women's Club; Business Men's League; Carroll Club; Drama League of America; Engineers' Women's Clubs; Flower Hospital Auxiliary; Friends of Music; Habima Guild; Junior League; Lawyers' Club; Leisure League of America; National Arts Club; Poetry Society of America; Professional Women's League; Smith College Club; The Town Hall Club; United Hospitals Camp Committee; Vassar Club; Women's International League; B'nai B'rith; Cathedral Community for Blind; Congregation Shaarezedek; Daughters of Zion; Hadassah; Jesuit Academy; LaSalle Academy; Manhattan College; Protestant Big Sisters' Council; Religious Drama Council of Greater New York; Riverside Church; Sacred Heart School; Temple Emanu-El; Zionist Organization of America; American Occupational Therapy Association; American Prison Association; American Psychiatric Association; American Red Cross; American Social Hygiene Association; Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor; Big Brother Movement; Boys Club of America; Catholic Charities; Children's Aid Society; Colony House; Crime Prevention Bureau; Five Points Mission; Flatbush Day Nursery; Grand Street Boys Association, Inc.; Grand Street Settlement; Greenwich House; Grosvenor Neighborhood House; Hecksher Foundation; Henry Street Settlement; Institute for Crippled and Disabled; Jacob Riis Settlement; Josiah Macy Junior Foundation; Juvenile Aid Bureau; Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association; Masters School Day Nursery; Milbank Memorial House; Mutual Aid Society; Neurological Institute of New York; New York Association for Blind; Russell Sage Foundation; Social Security Board; St. Thomas' Settlement House; Traveler's Aid Society; Trinity House; Young Men's Christian Association; Young Men's Hebrew Association; Young Women's Christian Association; Young Women's Hebrew Association; Adelphi College; Association of American Colleges; Barnard College; Brearley School; Carnegie Foundation; Chapin School; Child Study Association of America; City College of New York; Columbia University; Dalton School; Fordham University; Horace Mann School; Hunter College; International House; Long Island University; National League of Nursing Education; National Youth Administration; New School for Social Research; New York Board of Education; New York Public Library; Packer Collegiate Institute; Princeton University; Rutgers Alumni; St. John's University; Sarah Lawrence College; Teachers College; Todhunter School; Washington Irving High School; Consolidated Edison Co.; Gimbel Bros.; Macy & Co.; R. H.; Paramount News; Sheffield Farms Co., Inc.; Wanamaker's, John; Western Union; Consumers Union; New York City Housing Authority; Tenants' Union; Women Shoppers League; Women Voters League; American Legion; Army and Navy clubs and organizations; Boy Scouts; Camp Fire Girls; Elks; Girl Scouts; Jewish War Veterans; Kiwanis; Knights of Columbus; Masons; Odd Fellows; Rotary; Shriners; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Architects League; Authors League; Book and Magazine Guild; Cartoonists Union; Civil Service Forum; Composers, Authors, and Publishers Society; Composers League; Dramatists Guild; Henry Street Visiting Nurses Association; League of American Writers; Musicians Union; National League of American Pen Women; Newspaper Women's Guild; Post Office Employees; Social Service Employees Union; Stage Hands Union; Women's Speakers Club of America; Alteration Workers Union, 177; Automobile Workers Union, No. 1; Bakery International Union, Barbers Union, No. 1; Biscuit

Worker's Union, No. 405; Bricklayers Union, No. 110; Clothing Cutters Union, No. 4; Domestic Workers Union, No. 149; Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union, No. 16; Housewreckers Union; Pressers Union; Rank and File Cutters Union; Seamen's Social Club; Suitcase and Bagmakers; United Textile Workers; Waiters Union; Window Trimmers Union; Abyssinian Young People; Aunt Dinah's Kitchen; Copper Colored Queens; Epworth League; Federated Youth Clubs; Friends of Harlem; Harlem Children's Center; Harlem District Charity Organization; Harlem Hospital Nurses; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Negro Actors Equity; Negro People's Art Committee; New York Colored Mission; Opportunity magazine; Shaw University Alumnae; Tossaint L'Ouverture Club; Urban League; Anti-Nazi League; Progressive Women's Council; Hillsborough Club, Pompano, Fla.; Holy Cross Church, Miami, Fla.; St. Paul's School, Jacksonville, Fla.; Orleans Neighborhood Center, New Orleans, La.; Maison Hospitaliers, New Orleans, La.; Protestant Home for the Aged, New Orleans, La.; United States Marine Hospital, New Orleans, La.; Old Soldiers' Home, New Orleans, La.; Milne Home for Girls, New Orleans, La.; Children's Bureau, S. P. C. C., New Orleans, La.; Waldo Burton Memorial Boys Home, New Orleans, La.; St. Margaret's Daughters, New Orleans, La.; Windsor Center, Greensboro, N. C.; Thalian Association, Wilmington, N. C.; Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.; University Place Church, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Bryan School for Crippled Children, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Crippled Children's Hospital, Oklahoma City, Okla.; C. C. C. Camp, Purcell, Okla.; Bushnell Church, Detroit, Mich.; Knights of Columbus, Detroit, Mich.; Truth Lutheran Church, Detroit, Mich.; Redford Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.; Campbell M. E. Church, Detroit, Mich.; Y. W. C. A., Detroit, Mich.; Y. M. C. A., Detroit, Mich.; Peto Club, Detroit, Mich.; Dodge Community Center, Detroit, Mich.; St. Joseph's Infants, Cincinnati, Ohio; Central Y. M. C. A., Cincinnati, Ohio; Christ Church, Cincinnati, Ohio; General Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio; Jewish Center, Cincinnati, Ohio; St. Leo's Church, Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland State Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio; Martini Evangelical Church; Wise Temple, Cincinnati, Ohio; Knights of Pythias, Cincinnati, Ohio; League of Hard of Hearing, Cincinnati, Ohio; Western Illinois Teachers College, Macomb, Ill.; Eastern Illinois Teachers College, Charleston, Ill.; Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb, Ill.; Masonic Temple, Seattle, Wash.; American Legion Post, Seattle, Wash.; Marine Hospital, Seattle, Wash.; Queen Anne Club, Seattle, Wash.; Phinney Ridge Community Club, Seattle, Wash.; Federal Marine Hospital, Seattle, Wash.; King County Home for the Aged, Seattle, Wash.; Veterans' Administration, West Los Angeles, Calif.; Los Angeles Sanatorium, Duarte, Calif.; Huntington Park Women's Club, Huntington Park, Calif.; American House, Los Angeles, Calif.; First M. E. Church, Los Angeles, Calif.; Orthopaedic Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.; Children's Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.; University M. E. Church, Los Angeles, Calif.; University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Motion Picture Guild, Los Angeles, Calif.; House of Neighborly Service, Los Angeles, Calif.; Kora Temple Shrine, Lewiston, Maine; Unity Lodge, I. O. O. F., Portland, Maine; Pathfinder's Club, Deering High School, Portland, Maine; United States Veterans' Hospital, Togus, Maine; Y. W. C. A., Cambridge, Mass.; Masonic Temple, Worcester, Mass.; Seamen's Friend Society, Boston, Mass.; Jeffries Point Boys Club, East Boston, Mass.; Perkins Hospital, Boston, Mass.; Home for the Aged, Cambridge, Mass.; John J. O'Connell Post, American Legion, Dorchester, Mass.; Adult Recreation Center, Dorchester, Mass.; Fort Devens, Ayer, Mass.; C. C. C. camp, Warner, N. H.; Congregational Church, Candia, N. H.; Elks' Home, Nashua, N. H.; State Industrial School, Manchester, N. H.; Overbrook Hospital, Cedar Grove, N. J.; Robert Treat Boys Club, Newark, N. J.; Y. M. and Y. W. H. A., Paterson, N. J.; Dupont Women's Club, Arlington, N. J.; C. C. C. camp, Woodbine, N. J.; Newark University, Newark, N. J.; Optimist Club, Syracuse, N. Y.; Ursuline Academy, New Rochelle, N. Y.; Protestant Home, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rockland Street Hospital, Orangeburg, N. Y.; Presbyterian Church, Cuba, N. Y.; Children's Hospital, Buffalo, N. Y.; New York State Normal School, Plattsburg, N. Y.; Burke Foundation, White Plains, N. Y.; St. John's Church, Lattingtown, N. Y.; Adult Educational Center, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sons and Daughters of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Jewish Home for Children, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Women's Catholic Alliance, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sager Recreation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.; Women's Craft Center, Glenfield, Pa.; Sarah Street House, Pittsburgh, Pa.; East Side Hebrew Institute, New York City; Brashear Neighborhood House, New York City; Veterans Hospital, New York City; Odd Fellows, New York City; Hebrew Educational Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prescott Neighborhood House, New York City; Y. M. C. A., Brooklyn, N. Y.; St. Anthony's Church, New York City; Calvary Lutheran Church, New York City; Lexington School for the Deaf, New York City; Settlement House, Grand Street, New York City.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 21, to insert:

Sec. 38. Any Administrator or other officer named to have general supervision at the seat of government over the program and work contemplated under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and receiving a salary of \$5,000 or more per annum from such appropriations, and any State or regional administrator receiving a salary of \$5,000 or more per annum from such appropriations shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That the provisions of

section 1761 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any such appointee and the salary of any person so appointed shall not be increased for a period of 6 months after confirmation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the sections will be renumbered.

Without objection, those amendments which were passed over en bloc at the request of the Senator from Arizona and depending upon the action of the Senate with regard to the public-works amendment, will be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, at the end of line 23, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the words "on the basis of relative needs."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, because, although this is an important amendment, it is, indeed, a very simple one. I propose to add at the end of section 16 (a) the words "on the basis of relative needs." If the amendment should be adopted it would mean that all nonveterans would be given employment on the W. P. A., preference being given to those who have the greatest need. It would mean that when lay-offs take place on W. P. A. those with the greatest need would be laid off the last. My purpose in offering the amendment is twofold. In the first place, like every other Member of this body, I have received innumerable letters advising me that individuals who were in great need were not hired on W. P. A., whereas those with a lesser degree of need were hired. I have received complaint that when lay-offs were made those with comparatively slight degree of need were retained and persons with a large number of dependents were dismissed. It seems to me that it is clearly the purpose of the law to relieve the needy. If there is not sufficient money with which to relieve all the needy, then it seems to me that, insofar as nonveterans are concerned, we ought to give preference to the neediest people. The amendment does not affect the veterans' preference section, and I believe if it were put in as a direction to the Administrator it would make crystal clear the intent of Congress.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this matter was presented to the committee by the Senator from Massachusetts. The committee, having entire sympathy with the purpose of the amendment, after careful consideration decided that it was administratively impossible that the people should be put on the rolls on the basis of relative need. The provision of the act is that people shall be employed and retained. If every day the rolls, with more than 2,000,000 persons, men and women, on them, had to be examined and reexamined when someone was taken off, because it became necessary to go into their case histories, into their family lives, into their income to find out who was in the greatest need, it would be utterly impossible as a practical matter to carry out this well-intentioned amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I make one further statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has already spoken once on his amendment. Does he wish to speak on the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I wish to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is on the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I know the Senate is impatient to act, and I shall take but 1 minute. The amendment, it is true, was defeated in the Committee on Appropriations by a vote of 10 to 9. I think the Senator from Colorado raises somewhat of an unnecessary objection to it. I do not think that the administrative difficulty would be so great as he says it would be. It would not be necessary to go over the list every day. I think it is important to establish a principle in the measure. The House inserted a formula for the allocation of funds. That was one attempt to establish a principle rather than to leave the whole thing to the personal decision of those who may administer the measure. I

do not say that those who will administer it and have in the past administered it are not splendid men. However, they are but human. They are merely men like you and me, Mr. President. It seems to me that we should establish this thing on the basis of principle, and if there is a better or a fairer or a more humane principle than to give preference to the neediest persons, then I do not know what that principle is.

Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, for a great number of years I have been a close follower of the distinguished and able senior Senator from the State of Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. Since January last I have been closely and intimately associated with him here in the Senate. I wish to say that I agree with what he stated in his address a few moments ago. Then I also wish to congratulate him because of his wit, his humor, his penetrating scholarship, and his profound knowledge upon legislative matters which he extols so frequently in this historic Hall.

Mr. President, this distinguished statesman a few moments ago discussed the question of communism and brought enlightenment to the Senate and the country upon that question. In view of what he said I cannot refrain from discussing the subject of communism or a certain phase of it as it relates to the subject matter before the Senate.

Mr. President, the Daily Record, of Chicago, Ill., is the recognized Communist newspaper for the Midwest section of this Nation. On June 20 last there appeared in that daily paper an advertisement entitled "Send This Wire Tonight!" For the benefit of the Senate and for the RECORD I shall read this wire, which is as follows:

Senator SCOTT LUCAS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Defeat of the Woodrum W. P. A. bill is vital for the future of America. We expect you, as our spokesman, to vote against the three-man W. P. A. board, P. W. A. earmarking, abolition of Federal Arts Projects, slashing of N. Y. A. funds, limitation of funds for individual projects, and elimination of prevailing wages.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois has received from his own State 613 telegrams, most of them coming from the city of Chicago, concerning the W. P. A. appropriation measure which the Senate is now discussing. I caused the personnel of my office to make a close comparison of each and every telegram received. Out of the 613 telegrams which came, either advocating the defeat of the measure or supporting the W. P. A. appropriation measure, I found 107 telegrams word for word just like the telegram which was printed in the Daily Worker, which is the chief communistic organ of the Central West. In addition to the 107 telegrams, 30 more used that telegram as a basis for conveying to me the same information which is found in the advertised telegram. In other words, out of the 613 telegrams, 22 percent came from those who are avowedly Communists, or at least who read the Daily Worker, and have leanings towards communism in this country.

Mr. President, I agree with the philosophy of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], in saying that no individual who advocates the destruction of the Bill of Rights, or advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, is entitled to money from the Federal Treasury. And yet, notwithstanding their belief in and advocacy of such an un-American doctrine, they have the audacity and the temerity to send or cause to be sent to me 137 telegrams from my own State urging and insisting that I do certain things in connection with the W. P. A. program.

I have no way of knowing whether the 22 percent who sent me these telegrams are all Communists, but certainly they have been influenced by the advertisement to which I have referred, and could be convicted upon circumstantial evidence beyond any question of doubt of being either Communists or leaning toward the philosophy of communism. I give this information to the Senate merely to show how the Communists in the country are working day and night in connection with this particular program, which many of whom are

apparently enjoying to the utmost, notwithstanding the fact that they believe in a different form of government than that under which they live.

In conclusion, let it be understood that I make no complaint against the thousands of true Americans who write or send me their views upon W. P. A. legislation. I welcome their honest advice and counsel upon all questions of government because these are trying times—there are times that test the mettle of men and women in all walks of life. I shall support the present legislation, but it should always be understood that the telegrams of the Communists had nothing to do with it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending, and the yeas and nays have been ordered thereon. The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is not in order.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understood we had completed the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have been completed, but an amendment has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the yeas and nays have been ordered thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may the amendment again be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will again be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, at the end of line 23, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the words "On the basis of relative needs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and vote "nay." I am advised that the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea." He is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], who, I am advised, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—33

Austin	Gibson	Maloney	Townsend
Byrd	Gillette	Norris	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Gurney	Nye	Van Nuys
Danaher	Hale	Reed	Walsh
Davis	Holman	Reynolds	White
Donahay	Holt	Russell	Wiley
Frazier	King	Slattery	
George	Lodge	Taft	
Gerry	McCarran	Tobey	

NAYS—36

Adams	Connally	Hughes	Murray
Andrews	Downey	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Ellender	La Follette	Pepper
Barkley	Green	Lee	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Guffey	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Bone	Harrison	McKellar	Smathers
Bulow	Hatch	Mead	Stewart
Burke	Hayden	Miller	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Hill	Minton	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—27

Ashurst	Capper	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	Caraway	McNary	Smith
Barbour	Chavez	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Glass	Overton	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Herring	Pittman	Tydings
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz	Wagner
Byrnes	Logan	Sheppard	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 8, on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. (a) The Work Projects Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") in the Federal Works Agency is hereby continued as an agency of the Government for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section.

(b) Funds made available to the Administration for the purpose of enabling it to carry on the program of public works provided for by subsection (c) of this section may be expended for (1) the prosecution of projects approved for such Administration under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, the joint resolution of March 2, 1938, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (2) the following types of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, subject to the approval of the President: (A) Highways, roads, and streets; (B) public buildings (including schools, hospitals, and public-housing projects), parks, and other recreational facilities (including buildings therein); (C) public utilities, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to serve persons in rural areas (including projects sponsored by and for the benefit of nonprofit and cooperative associations); (D) sewer systems and water supply and purification systems; (E) airports and other transportation facilities; (F) flood control, drainage, irrigation, and conservation; (G) eradication of insects pests; (H) miscellaneous construction projects; and (I) educational, professional, clerical, cultural, recreational, production, service (including training for domestic service), and miscellaneous nonconstruction projects.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Administration (1) to provide opportunities for the employment upon a program of public works of employable persons who are unable to find employment in private industry and who are eligible for employment under the provisions of this section, (2) to aid self-help and cooperative associations for the benefit of needy persons, and (3) to provide emergency direct relief for needy persons in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(d) The Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to make such upward revisions in the monthly wage rates payable to persons employed on the public-works program provided for by this section as may be necessary to enable such persons to maintain a standard of living compatible with decency and good health.

(e) The hourly rate of wages paid to persons employed upon projects under this section shall be not less than the greatest of the following—

(1) The prevailing hourly rate of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Commissioner of Work Projects.

(2) Thirty cents.

(3) In the case of employment in any occupation for which minimum rates of pay for persons employed by private employers are established under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, such minimum rates.

(f) The monthly rate of wages paid to persons employed upon projects under this section shall be not less than \$36.

(g) Any person who is employable, who is unemployed, and who is unable to find suitable employment in private industry at wages not less than the prevailing rate of wages in his locality for work for which he is reasonably fitted by training and experience, shall be deemed to be eligible for employment on projects authorized by this section. The Commissioner is authorized to employ not less than 3,000,000 persons upon such projects as long as that number of persons are eligible for employment upon such projects.

(h) For the purposes of this section employment in any establishment at which there is a labor dispute shall not be deemed suitable employment.

(i) In the employment of persons upon such projects the Commissioner shall give preference to persons the income (other than public relief) of whose family units is less than the wages payable to such persons for employment upon such projects.

(j) All persons employed on projects established under the provisions of this section shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to deal collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in joint activities for the purpose of mutual aid and protection.

(k) No contract with respect to any such project, including the purchase of materials for such projects, shall be awarded to any person, firm, association, or corporation who, at the time of such award, is found to be interfering with, restraining, or coercing his employees in the exercise of their rights provided for in subsection (j). Any such contract shall contain a stipulation that in the performance of such contract the contractor will not interfere with, restrain, or coerce his employees in the exercise of such rights. Any violation of any such stipulation shall render the party responsible therefor liable to the United States for liquidated damages in the sum of \$100 for each day during which any such violation shall have occurred.

(l) There shall be established within the Work Projects Administration a Bureau of Labor Relations which shall be responsible directly to the Commissioner of Work Projects. The Bureau of Labor Relations shall be responsible for the development of proper labor relations procedures and practices. It shall have power to hire investigators and maintain offices in local and State Work Projects Administration districts. It shall have power to make decisions on all matters affecting conduct of labor relations, subject to final decision by the Commissioner.

(m) Appointments under the provisions of this joint resolution to administrative and supervisory positions shall be made upon the basis of competitive tests of a character similar to civil-service tests.

(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the foregoing subsections of this section.

(o) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, there is hereby appropriated \$2,250,000,000, together with all balances of appropriations under subsection (1) of section 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, as supplemented by Public Resolution No. 1 and Public Resolution No. 10 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which remain unobligated on June 30, 1939, including such unobligated balances of funds transferred to other agencies for nonconstruction projects under the provisions of section 3 of such act of 1938, as supplemented, or set aside for specific purposes in accordance with other law: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds heretofore irrevocably set aside for the completion of Federal construction projects under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, as amended, shall remain available until June 30, 1940, for such completion, and any such funds which remain unobligated by reason of the completion or abandonment of any such Federal construction project shall be returned to this appropriation.

On page 19, beginning with line 11, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 12, on page 20.

On page 20, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "(a)."

On page 21, beginning with line 14, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 8, on page 23.

On page 29, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 23, both inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has been generous enough to yield to me to present a very brief amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, my yielding in this instance does not result in my yielding the floor, does it?

Mr. BONE. I do not want to take the Senator off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Montana withdraws his amendment, he will have to take his chances of being recognized.

Mr. BONE. Then, Mr. President, in view of the fact that this amendment interests the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] very much, and has to do with municipal power, I am going to ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer the amendment now, and that the Senator from Montana may not lose the floor. This amendment will take only a very little time, I think. It seems to me that there is no reason why it should not be adopted.

The Senator in charge of the bill says he has no objection to the introduction of this matter into the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may present the amendment without the Senator from Montana losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is of the opinion that the Senate of the United States may do almost anything by unanimous consent; but he does not believe that one Senator may hold the floor, even by unanimous consent, while the Senate is passing upon an amendment. However, the Chair believes a unanimous-consent agreement could be entered into that the Senator from Montana should be recognized upon the disposition of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana be temporarily withdrawn and that the Senator from Washington be permitted to offer his amendment and that, at the conclusion of the consideration of that amendment, the Senator from Montana be recognized to reoffer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was demanding the regular order as the Chair said there was no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I desire to have considered. I should like to have it considered.

Mr. BONE. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Presiding Officer recognized the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The junior Senator from Montana did not yield the floor. Why should the junior Senator from Montana now be taken off the floor, when he has an amendment pending? The Record will show exactly what I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana did not lose any rights in the matter. The Senator's amendment will now be considered to be pending before the Senate. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this late hour I do not desire to enter into a lengthy discussion of the problem of unemployment; but it occurs to me, after having given most careful study to the situation, which confronts our country, that the program offered by the House joint resolution is utterly insufficient, and that a substantial increase should be made to carry the load of unemployment which is freely acknowledged to exist at this time.

Under the provisions of the House joint resolution it is proposed to reduce the relief rolls to a million and a half, while during the past year we have carried on the W. P. A. rolls an average of 3,000,000 workers. Anything less than

an average of 3,000,000 would be utterly insufficient in view of the tremendous unemployment situation in the country.

It is not only inhuman but it is a great injustice also to the business interests of the country, because while this is a relief program it is also a program of recovery; for the money spent on W. P. A. is money that aids in the small business and professional circles of the country, and is absolutely necessary that that program be carried out if we are going to continue to advance in the efforts to bring recovery.

My amendment not only provides for an average of 3,000,000 on the relief rolls, but it also relates to the other various features of the House joint resolution which have been in controversy here during the day and are inadequately provided for. It seems to me that the amendment I have proposed is the absolute minimum necessary if we are going to continue to make a substantial fight against the desperate conditions which prevail everywhere in the country today.

As I say, I have no desire to make an extended speech at this late hour. I had hoped that a resolution would be adopted here which would make provision for carrying on the W. P. A. program after the 1st of July, so as to give the Senate an opportunity to make a careful study of the situation. As it is, we are rushing through with this program, attempting with great hurry to make provision for the relief program for the coming year, and we are bound to find that a great many mistakes have been made.

The desperate situation which we find in the country today is the result of a break-down of our industrial system. It is due to no fault of the unemployed in the country. They have made no contribution to the conditions which make it necessary to carry out a program of this kind. All prominent authorities on the problem of unemployment have now come to concede that it is no longer merely an emergency situation, but that it is a continuing problem, and that the Government must meet the situation until industry is again able to furnish employment to these workers. Therefore, in any intelligent consideration of the problem of work relief, it must be borne in mind that the problem to be adopted should be envisioned to extend over a considerable period of time. The reason for this is that our economic system is undergoing a serious process of readjustment, particularly in connection with the production and distribution of goods. This process of readjustment will take time.

Until our economic machine can be corrected and readjusted to meet the present-day conditions of the country, the problem of unemployment will continue to persist. Through the rapid development of machinery and technological advancement, America has become the leading country of the world in mass production of goods. American plants today are equipped to turn out goods far beyond the capacity of our purchasing power. In every line of endeavor, technological development has made it possible to throw on the streets by the hundreds, and sometimes by the thousands, workers who, under these existing conditions, have nowhere to turn for a livelihood.

The amendment which I propose, covers extensive changes in the joint resolution as it refers to the W. P. A. The first and most important change which the amendment would make would be an appropriation of \$2,250,000,000 for the coming fiscal year in place of the \$1,477,000,000 provided in the House joint resolution. This appropriation is devised to provide an average of 3,000,000 jobs for the coming fiscal year. This is slightly less than the appropriation which was made available to the W. P. A. in the past fiscal year.

In spite of some estimates which have been submitted to the Senate, it is my contention that such a sum is a bare minimum to carry through the W. P. A. for the coming year. I would challenge any economic or political forecaster to say at this time, in good faith and with conviction, that employment would increase within the next year sufficiently to absorb a cut of a million from W. P. A. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has indicated that it is the estimate of the committee that the sum provided under the committee joint resolution would cut the W. P. A. to

approximately 1,500,000 jobs by the end of the coming fiscal year.

It has been pointed out often that it requires the reemployment of four unemployed persons to take one person from the W. P. A. rolls into private employment. Therefore, it would be required, in order to meet the committee's estimate, to have a reemployment of 4,000,000 persons in private industry during the next year. Of course, no such thing will happen.

Our previous experience relating to deficiency appropriations during the past years has indicated that predictions of increase in private employment to absorb the cuts in W. P. A. have not materialized. The only result of cuts on W. P. A. has been to increase the misery of people who are unemployed, and to bring a faltering, a hesitation, and retardation in the recovery movement which was under way at the time this session of Congress convened.

Nonagricultural employment, as estimated by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, has declined from 33,620,000 in December 1933 to 32,804,000 in April of this year. In other words, instead of increased employment we have increased unemployment.

I wish further to call the attention of the Senate to the testimony of the representatives of the United States Conference of Mayors, the representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, including the United Automobile Workers of America, and the testimony of the American Federation of Labor unions which appeared before the committee. All of these powerful and influential organizations emphatically indicated, either directly or indirectly, that there was no prospect of increases in private employment sufficient to absorb the cuts in W. P. A. so far as they could predict.

It seems to be perfectly clear that a serious cut in W. P. A. funds at this time would be a direct threat to the continuation of recovery. A glaring example stands before us of what happened in 1937 to the economy of the country, when Federal expenditures which were made available to purchasing power were abruptly cut off.

From that experience we should take warning. There we had a condition in which business was constantly increasing, and we began to curtail the W. P. A. rolls; we cut down the P. W. A. program, and immediately we began to find in the country a situation in which men were being thrown out of employment in private industry because there was no purchasing power in the hands of the people of the country to continue the activity of industry and business.

It seems perfectly clear to me that this should be avoided now. Certainly anyone who advocates similar cuts in Federal investment and expenditure now, at a time when the economy is actually operating at a lower level than in 1937, takes upon himself a terrible responsibility. I, for one, do not wish to see this Congress repeat the mistakes of 1937, and I have therefore offered this amendment to provide for what I believe to be a minimum of necessary jobs.

Mr. President, the amendment which I propose has been carefully prepared after careful studies and conferences with the legislative experts of the Senate. It is designed to overcome any defects which may be charged against the administration of W. P. A. and thus place the national program of work relief on a sound, effective, and efficient basis.

Mr. President, unemployment is the most serious and threatening problem which has ever confronted this Nation. It cannot be disposed of by merely indicting the vast army of unemployed American citizens as a lazy and worthless army of leeches hanging on the Government and refusing to find employment in private industry. The plain fact confronting the Nation is that there is no present opportunity for the millions now employed on the W. P. A. rolls, and also nearly a million in addition thereto who are qualified for W. P. A. enrollment, to find employment in private industry.

This desperate situation has developed as a result of the break-down of our industrial system of private competitive enterprise. It is due to no fault or blame on the part of these

millions of unemployed workers, but is due entirely to the failure of our economic system to afford them employment.

I feel very strongly, therefore, that this amendment offers to the unemployed, and to those who have a concern for the welfare of the working men and women of this country, the only practical opportunity to register their desire for an adequate provision for the unemployed.

Mr. President, I think it would be unfair for me to continue any argument on this subject at this time. It occurs to me that it should be plain to everyone that unless we continue this program of work relief on an adequate basis, unless we continue to spend money in this country to carry out a program of work for the unemployed and destitute people of the country, we are going to experience another recession such as that in which we found ourselves in 1938. I therefore submit that the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to comment for about 5 minutes in favor of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The chief appeal the amendment makes to me is that it tends to get away from the castigation of the people who work upon this program as "relief clients." I do not regard a person who has been displaced, for example, from the job he holds honorably because of technological improvements, as a person who is not deserving of confidence and respect in this country. I think that the first day we ever called this program a relief program, and tended to make everyone who was on the program almost to a degree ashamed of himself and ashamed of the fact that he was on it, we did a great injustice to a large number of honorable citizenry of this country.

I think I have mentioned heretofore an incident which came to my attention of a person who was working on W. P. A., who happened to be a young lady. While on a boat voyage on the Atlantic seaboard she met some other guests on the trip and got into close association with them. After the voyage had ended, and she had had a very pleasant association with these new-made friends, she wrote me and told me about it, and said, "I was ashamed to tell them that I was working on the W. P. A."

I do not think it is any less honorable to work on the W. P. A. than it is to work on the construction of a post office, which, too, is a Federal project; or to work on the construction of a highway which is contributed to by the Federal Government, or to be engaged in the construction of a ship, the development of which is subsidized by a Federal program. So that in the beginning of this endeavor to give jobs to people who did not have work in private industry we should never have castigated them as relief clients. They are merely American citizens who have a right to work, and to do any honorable work which may be provided for them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to ask a question, because, perhaps, I am not familiar with the matter. How does the question arise as to whether or not it is an honorable job or something else?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, a person has to be investigated by a social public welfare worker, and to be adjudicated by that person to be impoverished, and every means of subsistence so completely depleted that he is virtually on the verge of starvation before he is eligible to get the benefit of the work program. That is the application of a means test, which goes far beyond the natural right of an unemployed American citizen to do honorable labor, even if his National Government does make it possible for him to get the job.

What I was getting at, I will say to the able Senator from New Mexico, was that I am sorry that we ever applied a means test, that we ever so sharply limited the amount of the appropriation that there had to be a means test to restrict a place on the program to the relatively few who can pass it.

I think, if I may submit my individual opinion with humility, that this country is rich enough to give a job to

the people who are willing to work and who are able to work at the jobs they are fitted to fill.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to get the Senator's idea. Does he mean they should be employed regardless of the need?

Mr. PEPPER. Regardless of the need. I mean to say that a man who owns a little cottage, who has a wife and children, who, perhaps, is the absolute owner of the little cottage, may be working, for example, in some kind of a factory, whatever one may choose to take as an illustration, and that factory may put in new machinery which will do away with that man's opportunity to work in the factory.

Is that man, who cannot find a job in private industry, not to be permitted to work upon projects created by his National Government because he is the owner of a little cottage which he has been able to acquire through stinting in the years past? Why cannot his country provide for him an opportunity to work without him being so impoverished that he has to meet the ordinary means test that is applied to each person who now works upon the W. P. A.?

I believe that we would perhaps have saved the money in the long run if we had done away absolutely with the means test, if we had said, "We are giving jobs to American men and women who want to work and are willing to work a full day's work on a job they are fitted to do. If you cannot find a job by honest endeavor in private industry, we are not going to castigate you as a failure in life, we are not going to castigate you as one of the impoverished and one of the unworthy failures of your generation." Here is an alternative. Here is an implemented service that is made available by the activity of the National Government. I wish it were possible for that standard to prevail in the whole public-works program. It would cost but two or three or four million dollars, I believe, to carry out a program like that annually in this country, and I do not regard that as extravagant.

If we cannot build rural electrification lines and make those facilities available to the rural homes, if we cannot build homes for the people of this country who do not have decent habitations, if we cannot find enough highways, if we cannot find enough rehabilitation of eroded soil, and enough reforestation where the forests have been depleted in this country, in other words, if, with intelligent leadership, we cannot find enough projects to give employment to the honest men and women of this country who are able to work and willing to work, there is something wrong with the leadership of this Nation, and if we are unwilling to make available the funds to provide work of that character, there is something wrong either with the conscience or the sentiment, or, in any case, the judgment of this country.

I, therefore, commend the Senator from Montana. I think this is one of the best-drafted amendments I have seen in the Congress. It sets up a standard of employment which is related, in a degree, to the need of the applicant, but it does not apply the same sort of means test as is applied to the employee of the Works Progress Administration. It sets up about four or five possible wage standards, and provides that the highest one of those shall prevail, 30 cents an hour, or the prevailing wage in the community, or other wages which are specified in the amendment.

Mr. President, I think this administration should have the courage to say, "We are resolved that unemployment shall be abolished in this Nation; we are in competition with the dictatorships of the world, which are availing themselves of their resources of materials and men, every one of them to the last degree, and we cannot afford to let them get ahead of us by that kind of service to their people while we lag behind with the conscious, humiliating knowledge that ten or more million of the people of this country, however diligently they search in this rich Nation, are unable to find a chance to do an honest day's work without having people point them out as having so failed in life that they have to sink to the level of the means test of the W. P. A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following

Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Frazier	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Andrews	George	Logan	Shipstead
Ashurst	Gerry	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	Gibson	McCarran	Smathers
Bankhead	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Green	Maloney	Taft
Bilbo	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gurney	Miller	Tobey
Bridges	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Connally	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Danaher	Hughes	Pittman	White
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wiley
Donahey	King	Reed	
Downey	La Follette	Reynolds	
Ellender	Lee	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time I can more readily call attention to the situation than by having the amendment I propose read at the desk. On page 32, in line 14, I offer an amendment which will transpose the words "in any election" to follow the word "candidate."

Mr. President, as a matter of legal draftsmanship the words "in any election" should follow the word "candidate." The amendment which I have offered would simply rectify that particular language. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from New Mexico. So far as I know, there is no objection. I ask that the question be put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, line 14, it is proposed to transpose the words "in any election" to follow the word "candidate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, last night, when we were examining the bill in connection with the explanation of the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], his attention was directed to page 22, line 11, and at that point the Senator from Colorado explained that the language came to us from the House in the form in which it there appeared. I have an amendment at the desk with reference to line 11, and I ask that the clerk state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 11, after the word "exists", it is proposed to strike out down to and including the period in line 13.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would explain that amendment and advise us concerning what he has in mind.

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to do so, Mr. President. Let me point out that subsection (d), commencing in line 4, provides that "there shall be removed from employment on Works Progress Administration projects all relief workers whose needs for employment have not been certified by the formula which follows," first, that "a local public certifying agency" shall certify, or that the Work Projects Administration shall so certify where no local certifying agency exists. Then, in line 11, there is stated the alternative that

"where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept the certification by local public agencies." Obviously, this gives the Administration a veto power to nullify the certification by the local relief agency.

The alternative obviously goes right to the root of the very situation which led to the report by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which confronted us when we convened in January. Although the Senator from Colorado told us that there was no intention, certainly in the mind of the committee to make such a situation possible, yet the possibility of politics, and the application or misapplication of politics, which has led to the abuses in the W. P. A. in the past, is obvious. It is the type of language that ought not to be in the measure, and the amendment therefore is directed to cure the defect.

Does that answer the question of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; I understand. Mr. President, what the amendment does is to make final and conclusive the certification of the local board. The Federal Government has all the money, but under this provision it would be denied the right to exclude from employment anyone who was certified by the local board. There are six States in the Union where the Works Progress Administration has been compelled to set up its own certifying machinery because of the failure of the local boards or because of the lax and incompetent character of their work. It seems to me that that should be clearly understood. If Senators want the local board, the board of county commissioners or some other local board, absolutely to determine the amount of employment and to impose upon the Works Progress Administration any number of employees of their own choice, they should support the amendment.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the situation which existed during the winter of 1937 and 1938 at the time of the rapid increase of unemployment. There was a situation in many parts of the country against which complaint was made by Members of Congress of the failure of those who were entitled to Works Progress work because of the fact that they had not been certified by the local agencies. It was absolutely necessary and essential at that time in a number of instances throughout the country, in order to protect those who were unemployed, that the Works Progress Administration take action. First, they gave these local agencies a certain length of time in which to prepare their certified list. Then they found that that was not a successful method, and that they had to come in and do their own certifying. The amendment of the Senator which is now under consideration would take away from the Federal Government that power; it would take away that opportunity.

Of course, there are always those who see in everything some measure of politics. This is not a question of politics at all. It is merely a question of the Federal Government which supplies these funds seeing that they are properly used in instances where the local certifying agencies completely fall down on the job. There is no question of politics about it at all.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to say in corroboration of what the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington have said that, in my opinion, it would be one of the gravest mistakes that the Senate could make to agree to the amendment. It would make it impossible for the Federal Government to have anything to say about the certification of persons for relief. It would open the door wide for politics in its worst form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 8, after the word "months", it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert *Provided further*, That the first such investigation be made forthwith.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, section (f), on page 23, provides that an investigation of the relief rolls shall be made at least each 6 months. Therefore, it is possible, in my opinion, that such an investigation may not be made until the last of 1939, or after 6 months have elapsed. During that time we are all desirous of seeing that as many of those on relief as possible get as much good out of this money as possible. Therefore, I think it is the desire of all of us to see that we start out with a clean slate. My amendment provides nothing more or less than that an investigation be had immediately on the passage of the measure.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "\$123,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$153,000,000."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. Last year it had \$175,000,000, and used \$50,000,000. I think it is generally agreed by those who are familiar with the situation that this is the cheapest form of relief under any of the relief programs we have under the Administration. The beneficiaries are paying the money back. Instead of giving them relief, loans are made to them, and 25 percent of the loans have already been paid back.

In the Appropriations Committee an amendment was offered to replace this \$50,000,000. That was defeated by a narrow margin. I took it to the floor leader in charge of the bill, who is, of course, as we know, now coming to be known as "The Watchdog of the Treasury," and I have reduced the amendment from \$50,000,000 to \$30,000,000. I think the Senator in charge of the bill, as I have understood from his conversation with me, agrees to that amount. It will be a real saving ultimately, because, otherwise, a very large number of persons will be transferred to the relief rolls.

Mr. ADAMS. I told the Senator from Alabama that I had no control over the amount, but, so far as I was concerned, I was willing the matter should go to conference and there be further argued.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, having been one of those who suggested that this increase should be made in the committee, I am unwilling that it should be taken to conference with the sentence of death already pronounced upon it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I quite agree with the Senator. If that is the attitude of the Senator from Colorado, I want a straight vote, because I am not seeking any formal consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was quite apparent from what the Senator from Colorado said that the acquiescence was merely for the purpose of ending the debate and getting the pending matter out of the way.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot believe that the Senator from Colorado will take such a position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps that was an exaggerated statement, but I should like the Senator to explain just what he would do.

Mr. ADAMS. Exactly what I stated on the floor. I should be very glad to have the matter further discussed in the conference committee. I shall take it there.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot conceive it to be the attitude of the Senator from Colorado that he would take the amend-

ment to the conference committee merely for the purpose of letting it die there.

Mr. ADAMS. I am perfectly frank with the Senator. The Senator knows that in the committee a majority voted against the increase.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; a majority did not vote against this increase.

Mr. ADAMS. Well, against any increase.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; of \$50,000,000. It has been now reduced to \$30,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. I am quite in agreement with the Senator's view in connection with the major portions of the farm-security program as being very effective and very economical in its administration. I am not personally in a position to bind unappointed conferees. I will say that all I can do is to see that the matter receives consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not ask the Senator to bind anybody, but himself, but I know he is as firm in his convictions as any Member of the Senate and as determined in his attitude when he takes one. All I want to have the Senator do is to say that he will do his best to retain it in the measure in conference.

Mr. ADAMS. I will see that it receives fair consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I shall wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When this matter was discussed in the committee attention was called to the evidence which was presented by the representatives of the Farm Security Administration, that the repayment during the next fiscal year is estimated to be at least as much as \$40,000,000. My own feeling is that this amendment should provide \$40,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it should have provided \$50,000,000. That was the amount they had last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct about that. Only \$123,000,000 is appropriated in the joint resolution as it was reported by the committee. The evidence presented to the committee has established very clearly that more than \$82,000,000 of some \$340,000,000 has already been repaid.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Although these loans have been in force only 4 years, 87,000 families have not only been taken off relief but have been made self-sustaining by the operations of the Farm Security Administration. The testimony before the committee is that today there are at least 350,000 migratory farm families in the United States. The Farm Security Administration has succeeded in making more than 160,000 families completely self-sustaining. The evidence indicates that the net worth of families who have had the benefit of the farm-security loans has been increased in these 4 years by more than \$67,000,000. I am frank to say that there is no agency in all the vast number of agencies which have been created under the relief work which to my mind has established as good a record as that established by the Farm Security Administration. I think it would be exceedingly desirable if the full amount of the appropriation of last year were now allowed, and I hope that the Senator from Alabama will alter his amendment to make it at least \$40,000,000, and that we shall stand fast to secure that increased appropriation.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. Will the Senator from Wyoming state to the Senate what amount the President, after receiving reports from the Farm Security Administration, and being thoroughly acquainted with the facts, requested that Congress grant for this purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator wants to know what the Budget estimate was, I will say the Budget estimate was \$123,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he has made any effort to increase the appropriation for the National Youth Movement to the amount recommended by the President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator addressing his inquiry to me?

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. In explanation of the question I asked, I think it is very important in considering this matter at this hour that we take into consideration the fact that the President, the Budget Bureau, and the Farm Security Administration, after thorough study of the matter, made a request for \$123,000,000, and the House Appropriations Committee considered the whole matter carefully. The House considered it, and all agreed that \$123,000,000 was adequate for this purpose. I think the picture is not complete without that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, whatever may be the facts with respect to what the Senator has mentioned, they are to me irrelevant to this matter, because the judgment of the Budget Bureau, in my opinion, has failed to take into consideration the great success of the Farm Security Administration in establishing farm families upon land. That is the most essential thing that we can accomplish at this time. When we hear the stories which are being told and the evidence which is being presented of families wandering over the face of the earth, and when we know it is no longer possible for them to succeed as they have in the past, in establishing homesteads upon the public domain, this appropriation affords an opportunity for us to help establish firmly the theory of private property, which was so eloquently defended in the Senate this evening by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I believe that our own judgment should outweigh the judgment of the Bureau of the Budget or any other official who may not know the facts with respect to this administration.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. BURKE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from Wyoming, before he takes his seat, will make it clear that, with the exception of \$20,000,000 of this appropriation, it is all for loans, and that the repayments so far indicate that the Government will have a very small loss on these outlays. These people are paying for their own relief. They are in need, but they take these loans and pay for their own relief, and are rehabilitated as farm families on the land, rather than to flock into the cities, where they would undoubtedly wind up on the rolls of the Works Progress Administration, in which event the funds paid for their upkeep would be gone in perpetuity.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The record, in facts and figures as presented to the committee, is that a total of \$320,000,000 plus have been loaned, and of that fund, although the loan period has not yet been reached, \$82,939,000 have already been repaid.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me state to the Senator that the estimate of the Department is that 80 percent of the total amount appropriated by Congress has been repaid.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that 87,000 farm families have anticipated their farm loans and have paid off the loans in full before maturity.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That also is the evidence.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I merely want to ask one further question. Of course, the Bureau of the Budget took its information for what was needed for the Farm Security Administration from the Farm Security Administration's own statement. I ask the Senator what facts he has to present to the Senate to indicate a change of condition since the Farm Security Administration made its request of the Budget Bureau for \$123,000,000, which would now justify him in saying that the figure set by the Bureau of the Budget is irrelevant to this discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My answer to the Senator from Nebraska is that the Budget Bureau frequently acts without detailed facts, merely for the purpose of arriving at such a distribution of the funds as the Budget Bureau has determined in advance to reach. I do not believe that the reduction from \$173,000,000 to \$123,000,900 was based upon any facts that the Senator from Nebraska can produce.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that last year, with the larger appropriation, the Administration had applications for loans from 400,000 families in need, upon which they were unable to act. In the face of that statement, that testimony, and those applications on file with the Farm Security Administration, someone in the Bureau of the Budget brought about the reduction in the Budget estimate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no question that what the Senator says is true.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I want to add my voice to the voices of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. We are appropriating a large amount of money for use through various agencies. There is no agency connected with relief of any kind that has a record so successful as that of the Farm Security Administration. As Senators have already said, approximately 80 percent of the money used by the Farm Security Administration actually to locate people upon the land in homes of their own is being repaid.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only has the Administration made an effort but it has succeeded in the effort, which is the most important factor.

Mr. REED. We have been discussing appropriations for millions and scores of millions of dollars, which, when spent through other agencies, will never come back into the Treasury of the United States. Here is one undertaking on which we can more usefully employ the money, do more good with it, benefit more people, and salvage more of it and bring it back into the Treasury than in the case of any other agency provided for by the joint resolution.

When this amendment is voted upon I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote. I want the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to go into the conference with instructions from the Senate to maintain this increased sum.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me make clear that the Senator from Colorado has never gone into a conference but that he has maintained the position of the Senate; and the Senator from Colorado is never going into a conference unless he carries out the faith of those who send him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall take time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized on the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall yield in just a moment.

My remark at the outset may have provoked the statement which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has just made, to which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has made response. I wish to say that no member of the committee, and I am sure no Member of the Senate, fails to recognize the complete sincerity of the Senator from Colorado. In making my original remark, I was adopting, or attempting to adopt one of his own facetious methods of expression. I hope the Senator realizes that there was no intention on the part of anybody to cast any reflection whatsoever upon his loyalty to the instructions received from the Senate.

Mr. LEE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has been endeavoring to obtain the floor for sometime. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wish to add my voice to the voices of those who have spoken favorably on the amendment. I cannot understand how we can give away millions of dollars, and then hesitate so long on a loan, most of which will be repaid. In the same measure we propose to vote about one and a half billion dollars for W. P. A. work. We can feed a man on W. P. A., and yet at the end of the year our money is gone and he is still hungry, and we have not put him a dollar nearer to self support. However, here is a program which is self-supporting, self-liquidating, self-starting, and self-operating, and we hesitate to make available sufficient credit to establish these people on the soil. Put people on the pavement and they starve to death. Put them on the soil and they live. We are bringing them nearer to self-support.

I rise simply to add my voice at this time, so that the Senator from Colorado will know at least some of the sentiment of the Senate on this question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems the only point of difference in this matter is the extent to which the Senate will attempt to bind the Senator from Colorado as a conferee on the joint resolution.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Colorado agreed to accept this amendment. Of course, he cannot bind the conferees as to what will happen in conference; but it is my understanding that if this amendment is accepted and agreed to—and I will frankly say that I intend to support it, for I am in sympathy with it—the Senator from Colorado, without attempting to bind other conferees, says to the Senate and will say to the Senate that if he is a conferee, as no doubt he will be, he will use all reasonable and honorable means to see that the viewpoint of the Senate on this question is sustained.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. And it seems to me that is all we have a right to ask.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That question is out.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. REED. May I ask the Senator—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am letting all my time go to Senators who may speak in their own right. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it in order for me to move that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama shall be increased to \$40,000,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I make the motion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as I am concerned, I accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has a right to modify his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, as modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

Mr. REED and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to speak in my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this matter was presented to the Bureau of the Budget. It is just as easy to make any of these propositions look attractive as it is to make this proposition look attractive. I do not know anything about the question of the relative merits; but the Budget Bureau weighed those merits, and that was its duty.

So far as I am concerned, I do not think we ought to increase any appropriation that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended. In my opinion, the Budget Bureau has gone away beyond anything it is justified in doing under the law, which requires it to present a Budget. In my opinion, the President has gone away beyond anything he is justified in doing under legislation in presenting here a Budget three and a half billion dollars in excess of any possible revenues we can secure during the coming year. I say if, with all their disregard of proper financial management, the Bureau of the Budget still holds this appropriation down to \$123,000,000, or holds any other appropriation down, I intend to support at least the figure that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended.

I think that argument should apply to this amendment. These projects come one at a time. Just as attractive an argument can be made for every single appropriation as the Senator from Wyoming has made for this particular one. It can be done; but we have the same responsibility that the Bureau of the Budget has. We have the same responsibility to say we are going to hold the total down to a certain figure.

The President has recommended a reduction in relief. As I understand, this reduction is approximately the same percentage that is occurring in the general relief appropriation. It seems to me that if we are going to maintain any kind of a fiscal policy whatever we ought to vote to support the position of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I merely wanted to say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that if he received from anything I said any impression that there was any lack of confidence on my part in the senior Senator from Colorado, I desire to correct that impression. There is no man on this floor for whom I have higher respect, and I think no one respects him more than I do. I only suggested taking the yeas and nays so that we could emphatically go upon record upon this matter, and so that the senior Senator from Colorado would go into conference armed with a definite expression of the sentiment upon this question.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. AUSTIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. To the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the hour and the exigencies, does not the Senator think the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator appointed a conferee would attempt to carry out the mandate of the Senate just as sincerely on a viva voce vote as he would on a roll-call vote, if this amendment is put in the joint resolution?

Mr. REED. If I were in the place of the Senator from Colorado I should prefer to have a roll-call vote back of me when I went into conference on this particular item.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to record myself in favor of this amendment. From personal observation, I am convinced that this is the finest type of relief in which the Federal Government is engaged; but I wish to say in passing that in my opinion there is a grave defect in the Bankhead-

Jones Act, to which this section of the pending joint resolution refers.

The joint resolution provides that the funds provided in this section shall be available for farm-debt adjustment service, and making and servicing loans under this section and prior laws. That provision really refers to the Bankhead-Jones Act. The yardstick for allotment of these funds to the different States contains one element which is fallacious. It is an element which recognizes the conditions that exist in only certain States of the United States and disregards a different condition which obtains in a few other States. That is the yardstick consisting of farm tenancy.

Our system in certain of the States is entirely different from that in other States. We find farmers on farms who have an equity in the land; the title came to them, and they have the title; but they are in distress, in just as great distress as the farm tenant in the South is. The condition to which I refer exists in New Hampshire, in Vermont, in Wisconsin, in Minnesota; it is scattered over the northern part of the United States; and those States have been deprived of any substantial benefits under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act, because the allotment measured by the yardstick of farm tenancy is so small that they can participate only to a slight extent.

Mr. President, some time ago I introduced in the Senate a bill, known as Senate bill 2200, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] assured me of his sympathetic interest in that bill; but, somehow or other, the bill is still in the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Permit me to say to the Senator that there has been no opportunity, since we discussed the subject, for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to act on the bill. I had the bill, and intended to request the committee to make a favorable report on it; but we got tied up in a hearing, and adjourned today with only one member present. The others had to rush over here to answer to their names on a quorum call. I say that for the information of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama for that information, and I commend him to the other members of that great committee of the Senate. I take this occasion to ask the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to rectify this mistake promptly, so that there may be a fair and equitable allotment of these funds. I know the good that is done with them, and I want to see relief given to the States where there are good people on farms who cannot pay the high rate of interest charged under the old contract, and cannot meet the amortization or payments on the principal at the present time because of the depression, who need and who are entitled to the benefit of writing down the capital and of writing down and adjusting the interest rate which can be afforded only through this type of relief, which the Federal Government has given by means of the Farm Security Administration. They are entitled to it as much as are the people of the South; and I think the great Committee on Agriculture and Forestry ought to get together and afford that relief before the present session of Congress adjourns.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the hour is late—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has already spoken on the amendment.

Mr. REED. I was going to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I shall support the amendment offered to increase the funds to be available to the Farm Security Administration.

As a practical matter, we know that the Farm Security Administration, like other Government agencies and departments, could use more money; but, unlike certain other

agencies, it could use these funds to the very great advantage of the people and our whole economic and social order.

I know of no other agency created by the Congress to alleviate the suffering of needy persons that has done more than has the Farm Security Administration to relieve conditions wrought by depressed economic conditions, or that has done more to rehabilitate people. It has done fine work in Montana. I wish it were possible to broaden its powers in certain respects, and to increase its appropriation so that it might do more. I have in mind a stump-clearing project in northwestern Montana. If the Farm Security Administration had the funds, together with the proper authority—and I understand the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a bill on the Senate Calendar, Senate bill 1365, which would give the Farm Security Administration that authority—it would be possible to clear land in the great Flathead country in Montana, which would make self-sufficient many deserving families.

Before closing, I wish to pay tribute to those charged with the responsibility of administering the Farm Security Administration—Dr. Alexander, the Administrator; Mr. Baldwin, the Assistant Administrator; Mr. Wilson, regional director at Denver, and the many others with whom I have come in contact.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, a number of Senators have expressed their very great faith in the Farm Security Administration. I fully share that faith. I believe it is one of the finest of the governmental agencies dealing with this very difficult problem. The only place where I differ with these Senators is that after having expressed their great faith in the Farm Security Administration they promptly eat their words, and say that that agency did not know what it was doing when it gave its consent to a reduction to \$123,000,000 of the appropriation for the work for the coming year. I go all the way with the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Nebraska is fair-minded.

Mr. BURKE. Is the Senator asking me to yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am.

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to say to the Senator that the Farm Security Administration necessarily acquiesced in the ruling of the Bureau of the Budget. It could not ask for any more than the Budget Bureau recommended.

Mr. BURKE. No statement has been made here, and, so far as I know, there is nothing in the record to indicate that the Farm Security Administration asked for more than \$123,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They asked for it as strongly as they could, consistently with the regulations. They said they had 400,000 worthy, needy applicants that they could not accommodate under the amount appropriated. How much stronger could they make it?

Mr. BURKE. So far as I know from attendance at the committee hearings and from examination of the record, the Farm Security Administration and the President were entirely satisfied with the request for \$123,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They were not.

Mr. BURKE. The only answer made here today is, "Why, last year we appropriated \$50,000,000 more than that." Does that mean that because we appropriated—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. In a moment, when I finish the sentence. Does that mean that because 1 year, in the depths of distress, we appropriated a certain sum, we must keep on every year from now until the end of time appropriating the same sum? Are we never to come to the time when we can make any reductions in these matters?

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator began his sentence, in which I so rudely interrupted him, with the qualifying phrase, "So far as I know." How far does the Senator know? Is it not a fact that the Senator has not the faintest evidence as to what representations were made

by the Farm Security Administration to the Bureau of the Budget, and not the faintest evidence of any reasons why the Bureau of the Budget reduced the appropriation?

Mr. BURKE. I know that the President of the United States submitted to Congress his request for \$123,000,000 to carry on the work of the Farm Security Administration for the coming year; and I assume—and I think I am entitled to indulge in that assumption—that the President was acting after thorough consultation and advice with those who were carrying on this important work. If the President felt that under those circumstances \$123,000,000 was adequate to carry on this work properly, that is all the information I need on this particular subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator bases his argument entirely upon an assumption that the unknown evidence which was submitted by the Budget Bureau, if any, and the unknown evidence upon which the President acted, if he did act, would bear out what he has to say. Contrary to that assumption, I have presented to the Senator facts and figures which cannot be denied, and which, in my opinion, altogether outweigh the mere assumption of the genial and eloquent Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. If I may reverse the roles here and ask the Senator from Wyoming a question, what does he mean by saying that I assumed that "the President acted, if he did act"? What does he mean by "if he did act"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said he acted upon evidence that was presented by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BURKE. Surely the President did not act without any evidence at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, it may be that the Senator himself does not always sign his mail after reading all of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sure we all recognize this issue as too important to human interests to go off on a technical argument. The Senator from Nebraska is a fair-minded man. I recognize the splendid purity of his motives. He is inquiring whether there was any request for more money than the Bureau of the Budget or the President recommended.

Mr. BURKE. Any serious request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He now charges the Farm Security Administration with not asking for a larger amount. Let me read from the hearings. The Senator knows the limitations upon Federal departments about incurring deficiencies and asking for amounts in excess of those recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Let me read to the Senator what was said in the hearings, because I want to convince him. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was questioning Dr. Alexander, and asked this question:

What do you think about the basis of need? Do you think that there will be as much need?

He was speaking about last year, when they had \$135,000,000.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Senator RUSSELL, there are these 400,000 families we have appealing to us now. Somebody has to take care of them wherever they are or they are going to go to the cities—

Take care of them where they are on the farms, or they will go to the cities—

or they are going to go wandering around over the county.

Does not the Senator recognize that that was as far as Dr. Alexander could go in calling upon Congress to increase that amount, reminding us that 400,000 families are wandering, when we can keep them on the farms by loans?

Mr. MINTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MINTON. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. BURKE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana if he has a contribution to make to the debate.

Mr. MINTON. If the Senator will yield, does he not think we ought to enforce the rule we have of a limitation on time? Otherwise we will go on all night.

Mr. BURKE. I presume that the Presiding Officer will indicate when my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the time of the Senator from Nebraska on the amendment has expired he will be notified.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, all I desire to do at this time is to express my very great approval of the Farm Security Administration and to reiterate my feeling that, if Mr. Alexander and the others felt that there was going to be great hardship if this reduction from \$175,000,000 to \$123,000,000 were made, those very able men would have presented that matter to the President of the United States and to the Bureau of the Budget, and when the request was made of Congress it would have been for an amount adequate to take care of the needs. I am not willing by my voice or vote here to express a lack of confidence in the President or in the Bureau of the Budget or in the Farm Security Administration, and therefore I shall stand by their recommendation.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. If I still have time left, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. May I inquire whether those of us here may take new hope and new heart from the assertion by the Senator from Nebraska that he has confidence in the President of the United States that he is going to give full faith and credit to any recommendation the President may make?

Mr. BURKE. There are clouds which have silver linings, I will say to the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there has been some discussion as to the source of the figures given here. In the House hearings, when Mr. Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture, appeared, with Mr. Baldwin, Assistant Administrator, it was definitely shown that there were unexpended balances as of June 30 of \$15,457,000, which previously it had been expected would be used, which will be available. So if the amendment should not be agreed to, there would be a total of over \$139,000,000 allocated in this instance. Mr. Baldwin also stated that the request before the committee at the time was from the President.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, I thought I understood the Senator from Kentucky a few moments ago to arrange for the amendment as originally submitted to be taken to conference in the general form in which any action of the Senate goes to conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this whole debate seems to have followed a colloquy nearly an hour ago with reference to the extent to which the Senator from Colorado considered himself bound by the adoption of the amendment, which he agreed to accept. I undertook to clarify the situation, and if I did not succeed, I should like to make a further effort.

I understood that the Senator from Colorado would consider himself, without attempting to bind other conferees, under the same obligation to use all reasonable and honorable means to see that the Senate viewpoint on this amendment was sustained as much as in the case of any other amendment the Senate puts in the joint resolution. It seemed to me that with that understanding—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas cannot take the Senator from New Mexico from the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas desires to raise a point of privilege, of course, I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I rise to a point of privilege with respect to the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky. I am heartily in favor of the amendment, but I do not think it is

in order to put the Senator from Colorado on the hot skillet here, and make him promise in advance what he will individually do as a conferee. If we start that sort of practice on the floor of the Senate, it is in derogation of adjustments between the two Houses.

Every Senate conferee is in honor bound to go to a conference and represent the views of the Senate, but not to represent the views of the Senate merely on one point. There will be 50 points on which the Senator from Colorado will be supposed to represent the views of the Senate. If we single out one or two of them and say "Now, honor bright, you are going to stick to this one," an agreement would never be reached. So I think it is out of order for any such proposition to be put up to the Senator from Colorado. He is a Senator, he is an honorable Senator, and when he is appointed by the Chair as a conferee he is supposed to go to the conference to represent the views of the Senate in its entirety, not merely on some little, inconsequential amendment. I, therefore, think it is out of order to extort from the Senator from Colorado any promise regarding this amendment.

I am for the amendment; I believe it should be adopted. I think the Farm Security Administration is doing a great work, but I do not see anything that is so sacred about this particular amendment that we should go to the extent of demanding of the conferees in advance that "before you ever go to conference, you are told you can sacrifice anything else, but you cannot sacrifice this amendment."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would not agree to put the Senator from Colorado on the spot, so to speak.

Mr. CONNALLY. I referred to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not attempting to bind the Senator from Colorado. Nearly an hour ago the Senator from Colorado agreed to accept this amendment, and if his word had been accepted by the Senate, this matter would have been disposed of nearly an hour ago, but because the Senator from Colorado could not, and was unwilling, in all frankness, to bind the other conferees, to say that he would stand there indefinitely and would not yield on this amendment this debate has ensued.

It seemed to me, in all fairness to the Senator from Colorado and to the Senate, that his position ought to be made clear, that he does not take any different position on this amendment from that he takes on any other amendment put on the joint resolution by the Senate; that is, as a Senate conferee he would attempt to see that the Senate viewpoint was sustained so far as he could reasonably do so, but he could not guarantee that he could bring the joint resolution back to the Senate with the amendment agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely rose to state what the Senator from Texas has so well said, that this situation should never have arisen in the Senate as it has arisen. The Senator from Colorado did say everything a Senator could say under the circumstances; and although I am favorably inclined to the amendment, the way the matter has arisen I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in reply to the Senator from New Mexico. What the Senator from Texas was objecting to was what he understood to be the suggestion by the Senator from Kentucky that we could adopt this amendment without a roll call provided the Senator from Colorado would make some sort of a declaration as to what he would do as a conferee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator misunderstood me. My remarks were based on the unwillingness of the proponents of the amendment to accept the statement of the Senator from Colorado nearly an hour ago that he would see that this amendment was given every possible fair consideration in conference. That is all I think we ought to demand of the Senator from Colorado; and, based upon that, I thought we might save time, and we might have saved time by eliminating

all this debate, and even a roll call, but apparently that is impossible, so we will vote on it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I have not spoken on the pending joint resolution, and I have not disturbed the Senate in some time. [Laughter.] The Senator from Texas assumes that every Senator here is as good a gentleman as the Senator from Colorado is a conferee, and he accepts the Senator from Colorado as a 100-percent conferee. It seems to me that when a Senator is discussing the privilege of the Senate, Senators ought to listen. They would do well to listen.

The reason for raising this question is that I think it is a matter which goes to the fundamental privilege of the Senate, and I do not think we ought to violate or abuse our fundamental privileges. I beg the pardon of the Senator from Kentucky. I probably misunderstood him. What I am objecting to, however, is the demand that Senators make promises on the floor as to what they will do in conference about some particular amendment. When a Senator goes into a conference he is supposed to represent the views of the Senate on the entire bill. If he could get all the amendments agreed to, that would be well, and if he must sacrifice some of them, he must do the best he can.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know whom the Senator has in mind, but I want to state that I did not take any part in any effort to demand any promise of the Senator from Colorado. I would trust him as freely as I would trust myself.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator would.

Mr. BANKHEAD. However, in view of the way this whole matter developed, the way the Senator from Colorado expressed the idea that he would take the amendment to conference, I believe it would strengthen his hand in conference with the House if the Senate would now back up the amendment by a vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to delay the Senate longer. I merely wanted to make clear the reason why I interjected these remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I come from one of the drought-stricken States. We have had droughts in the western part of North Dakota for 10 years, and a dozen other States have had the worst droughts in the history of the Nation in recent years. The drought area extends from the Canadian border clear to the Mexican border. The farmers there have carried on, and held on to their lands as best they could year after year, hoping for better crops. They are entitled to have assistance, and they must have assistance if they are to stay on the land.

The reason why there is a little balance left in the farm-security fund, as there is at the present time, is because on the 1st of April they cut off the grants they had been paying in the drought areas. Farmer after farmer has made appeals for a little money to keep his family from starving to death. They did not have anything on which to live, in many cases no crops last year, and nothing to live on. Their allotments or benefit payments were cut off, and the grants were cut off on the 1st of April, and many of them had to be reinstated in order that they might be kept going. Many of them have been going hungry during the past month, not only in North Dakota, but in every one of the drought-stricken States.

In addition to that, last year there were low prices, and there was little or no money for the farmers, and they had to have relief. This year prices are still low. Wheat is selling in North Dakota for as low as 55 cents a bushel, corn is low, and as we know, cotton is low in the South, and the farmers in all the Nation will have to be helped again.

The only criticism I have of the amendment is that it does not provide sufficient to take care of the needs. It is not the fault of the Farm Security Administration that there is not a larger sum carried in the bill as it passed the House.

It is because they have been told to keep down expenses, and must keep them down, and they did their part along with others. But if there is any department of the Government which needs assistance in the pending measure it is the Farm Security Administration, because they take care of the farmers who have been in hard circumstances, who have lost their crops through no fault of their own, and must have help until they can get a crop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote on this amendment, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before with reference to my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I announce that my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained from the Senate by reason of illness. He has a special pair on this vote with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. If he were present and at liberty to vote my colleague would vote "yea," and I understand the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote "nay."

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the negative). I am advised that my general pair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] would vote as I have voted. I therefore let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—49

Andrews	Ellender	McCarran	Russell
Austin	Frazier	Maloney	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Gibson	Mead	Slattery
Barkley	Gillette	Miller	Smathers
Bilbo	Guffey	Minton	Stewart
Bone	Hayden	Murray	Truman
Bulow	Herring	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Norris	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Nye	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Holt	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	
Davis	La Follette	Reed	
Downey	Lee	Reynolds	

NAYS—20

Adams	Green	King	Taft
Burke	Gurney	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Hale	Lucas	Townsend
Danaher	Hatch	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gerry	Hughes	Radcliffe	Walsh

NOT VOTING—27

Ashurst	Caraway	Logan	Shipstead
Bailey	Chavez	Lundeen	Smith
Barbour	Donahey	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	George	Overton	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Glass	Pittman	Tydings
Brown	Harrison	Schwartz	White
Byrnes	Johnson, Calif.	Sheppard	

So Mr. BANKHEAD's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, line 11, it is proposed to strike out all of section 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations made in this joint resolution shall not be less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Commissioner of Works Projects: *Provided*, That not less than the minimum rate of pay established by the Fair Labor Standards Act (Public Law No. 718, 75th Cong.) for private industry shall be paid to any person engaged upon projects under this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That in fixing the monthly earning schedule of persons employed upon work-projects projects, the Commissioner of Work Projects shall consider differentials in such earnings according to the various classes of work only and shall not give consideration to differentials between cities, counties, or other areas upon the basis of degree of urbanization, or any other factor that will tend to discriminate against the less urbanized areas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we commenced discussing this question in 1933. We have been carrying on the work ever since. It is proposed to maintain in America the wage standard for American living as established by American labor. If the Senate of the United States does not want those who are especially interested in wage standards to advise, then I would say that the Senate should disregard the views of the President of the United States, because following nearly 7 weeks of debate in 1933, at the conclusion of which we were defeated in the prevailing wage amendment, the President of the United States caused an investigation to be made out of which three great zones in America were established looking to the carrying out of the prevailing wage in each of those zones.

The amendment offered takes into consideration first of all the President's executive proclamations following the battle that he conducted in 1933 for the continuation of the prevailing wage.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is the second paragraph or section of the Senator's amendment, relating to the eliminating any differential, a new principle?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not a new principle, if the Senator has in mind a principle that has been worked out and is now in the law.

Mr. WALSH. I understand clearly what the Senator said in reference to the first paragraph and the application of the prevailing rate of wage during the years that have passed; but I have wondered whether the second paragraph was likewise in the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. The second paragraph or the second proviso?

Mr. WALSH. The latter is a better expression.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not in the law, but is in the Executive order.

Mr. WALSH. So that the Senator contends that both the first proviso and the second proviso are now, by reason of the Executive order, the law and the manner in which the wages are adjusted and determined under W. P. A. appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is entirely correct. In the President's Executive order is involved the security wage. So the security wage has been established, after a study resulting in an Executive order by the President. And then involved in this matter is something more, namely, the wage and hour provision. In other words, we established a floor below which wages could not go, namely, 25 cents per hour.

Mr. WALSH. Does that floor increase with the years, as the wage-and-hour law provides?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not increase.

Mr. WALSH. It remains for the present year at the minimum wage fixed in the wage and hour law, namely, 25 cents?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. But may I bring to the mind of the Senator the three zones established by the Executive order in which the particular minimum-wage scales prevail? There are four wage scales.

Mr. WALSH. Is the minimum wage the same in all those regions?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are not the same. They cannot be the same, because the wage and hour measure does not contemplate that they would be the same.

Mr. WALSH. The wage and hour measure makes the minimum wage uniform throughout the whole country?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, sir; uniform over the entire country. That is true. But remember that the Executive order provided for three zones, and those zones with their particular classification of hours and the particular classification as to monthly earnings, must be contemplated.

I may say, Mr. President, that while we started the battle for this amendment in 1933 with the idea of establishing a wage in conformity with what the labor class of the country had evolved by experience, we have now worked into the amendment not only that experience but also the law as it has been evolved by the Congress.

I submit it to the Senate with the hope that it may be adopted as a substitute in place of the present section 15.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. As the Senator knows, I am strongly in favor of the prevailing-wage principle. I should like to ask the Senator whether the words in the amendment "or other areas" mean that there shall be no difference in pay or in rates of pay between the various sections of the country?

Mr. McCARRAN. In that regard, if the Senator will bear in mind in connection with my answer the three zones, each of which carries its particular rate of pay—

Mr. LODGE. That is what the W. P. A. calls a wage region.

Mr. McCARRAN. A wage region. With that in mind, if I catch the Senator's question, I think my answer is that within the zone there is no differential.

Mr. LODGE. This would not act as a prohibition to a differential between different zones, would it? There would be a differential between the different zones, but there would not be a differential within the zones; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. There would be no differential within the zone.

Mr. LODGE. But there would be one between the zones.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. In other words, let us assume we are in the first zone, and let us assume, if I may go home, that the principal city in my State, with a population of 30,000, has established a wage scale which is recognized by the various methods by which recognition is accomplished. Now, let us assume that a project is outside that particular city. Then the wage scale of that city shall prevail in that project which is outside. But let us assume that over in Idaho, an adjoining State in the same zone, a different wage scale is attempted to be established. Then the amendment carries the idea that the same wage scale shall prevail within the zone in the same district.

Mr. LODGE. But it does not require that the same wage shall be paid in Nevada as is paid in Massachusetts, let us say?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not certain whether or not Massachusetts is in the same zone.

Mr. LODGE. Assume that they are in different zones.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am assuming that. I would say no. I rather think, if I hold in my mind the zones as they have been portrayed, that New England is in the same zone as Nevada.

Mr. LODGE. Then that is a poor illustration. The point I am trying to get at is that there is no attempt in this amendment to iron out all the rates on a uniform basis.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct in that regard.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment and ask for a record vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the first prevailing wage scale was approved by the President of the United States on March 3, 1931. During the years I have been in the Senate I have consistently upheld the principle of the prevailing wage. In 1931 I was actively identified with the movement which finally resulted in the enactment of the Davis-Bacon bill. I have followed this principle through in its application to industrial firms doing business with the Government under the terms of the Walsh-Healey Act. I favored and voted for the essential principles of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The American Federation of Labor over a long period of time has held a consistent position in these matters.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the Davis-Bacon Act, approved March 3, 1931, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The act is as follows:

[Public—No. 798—71st Congress]
[S. 5904]

An act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That every contract in excess of \$5,000 in amount, to which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party, which requires or involves the employment of laborers or mechanics in the construction, alteration, and/or repair of any public buildings of the United States or the District of Columbia within the geographical limits of the States of the Union or the District of Columbia, shall contain a provision to the effect that the rate of wage for all laborers and mechanics employed by the contractor or any subcontractor on the public buildings covered by the contract shall be not less than the prevailing rate of wages for work of a similar nature in the city, town, village, or other civil division of the State in which the public buildings are located, or in the District of Columbia if the public buildings are located there, and a further provision that in case any dispute arises as to what are the prevailing rates of wages for work of a similar nature applicable to the contract which cannot be adjusted by the contracting officer, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of Labor for determination and his decision thereon shall be conclusive on all parties to the contract: *Provided*, That in case of national emergency the President is authorized to suspend the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 30 days after its passage but shall not affect any contract then existing or any contract that may thereafter be entered into pursuant to invitations for bids that are outstanding at the time of the passage of this act.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am for the pending amendment and hope it will be enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order to perfect the amendment and to make clear the point which was raised by the question of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I move that the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "city" the word "or" and by striking out after the word "county" the words "or other areas." That modification makes clear the interpretation which the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Massachusetts have agreed upon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator so modifies his amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may we have the amendment as now modified reported?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment, as modified, proposes to strike out, on page 19, line 11, all of section 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations made in this joint resolution shall not be less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Commissioner of Work Projects: *Provided*, That not less than the minimum rate of pay established by the Fair Labor Standards Act (Public Law No. 718, 75th Cong.) for private industry shall be paid to any person engaged upon projects under this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That in fixing the monthly earning schedule of persons employed upon work-projects projects the Commissioner of Work Projects shall consider differentials in such earnings according to the various classes of work only and shall not give consideration to differentials between cities or counties upon the basis of degree of urbanization or any other factor that will tend to discriminate against the less urbanized areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as modified. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

On a division the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 16, line 13, I move to strike out the figures "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000,000." That is to restore the Budget estimate, so that the Commissioner would be authorized to allocate not to exceed \$75,000,000 to other Federal agencies for Federal projects.

The change in the language is a mere limitation. The amount of money appropriated in the bill is in no manner affected. Senators who do not understand this proposal think that if money is transferred or allocated over to a Federal department, in some way or other we lose money by the operation. What it means is this: We appropriate \$1,477,000,000 to hire to perform work people who are on relief. We are going to pay them by the year. They are going to be on relief, and the question is, For whom shall they work?

If they are on a project sponsored by a municipality, a county, or a State, the Federal Government pays them to work for the county, the State, or the municipality; but if it is on Federal property, we have a limit to the effect that only \$50,000,000 may be expended. It is as though I hired a man by the year to work on my farm. I contract with him. I know I have to pay him by the year. However, when it comes time for him to do some work, I say to him that he may not work on my farm. My neighbor may need some work done, and he may go over and work for him, and I will pay him, but he cannot work for me.

The testimony before the committee is that the entire \$50,000,000 allowed by the House for this purpose could be expended by the War Department alone. I shall not take the time to read from the hearings, but in the hearings will be found the statement that last year the War Department had \$26,000,000 of this kind of labor furnished to it for work upon airports and upon Army posts all over the United States. The War Department could use \$50,000,000. The representative of the Navy Department testified that the Navy Department could use \$12,000,000. The Department of Agriculture could use \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000, if it could obtain the money. In my judgment, the appropriation should be \$100,000,000. The Budget estimate is \$75,000,000. I ask that the Budget estimate be restored.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this matter has been before the Senate on other relief bills. The question is, What is the appropriate amount? In the bill of a year ago the amount fixed was \$60,000,000 on an appropriation relatively the same. It seems to me the Senator from Arizona is being unduly liberal with Federal projects. I move to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona so as to make the amount \$60,000,000 instead of \$75,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest to the Senator that a good place to make that reduction is in conference. The House

has allowed \$50,000,000. The Budget estimate is \$75,000,000. If we set the figure at \$75,000,000 we shall probably receive \$60,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. This is a good place to make the reduction.

Mr. HAYDEN. I hope the Senator's amendment to my amendment will be defeated, and that we will be allowed to take the Budget estimate to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on page 18, line 6, I move to strike out the figures "\$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], as well as other Senators, the amount on this page was not changed by the Senate committee. The limitation of \$50,000 is put upon Federal buildings. I presume that means post offices. So far as Federal post offices are concerned, I think it may be advisable to limit the amount expended on any one building to \$50,000, so that any general post office building program can be carried in a bill for that purpose.

A limit of \$40,000 of Federal contribution toward any sort of building would very seriously disrupt the building program of the W. P. A. in all the States and make it almost impossible for any building such as a high school to be constructed in a large city. A Federal contribution of \$40,000 may be enough for the small towns; but in the larger cities, and even in the larger towns, on the question of building high schools and other public buildings of a permanent and valuable nature, the \$40,000 limitation seems to me to be entirely too small. For that reason I have offered the amendment to increase the amount to \$100,000. I hope the committee may accept the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. ADAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to say only a word to supplement my personal knowledge of the statement just made by the Senator from Kentucky. At every one of the State institutions in my State we have tried to erect some permanent buildings in cooperation with the W. P. A., the State putting up half the money. As a result, we have some permanent structures that are of permanent value and a real credit to the W. P. A. program.

Great criticism has been directed at the W. P. A. because we started it off as a leaf-raking enterprise, and we have never yet lived it down. So, the more durable and permanent we make W. P. A. projects, I think the more respect and confidence they will have in the public mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the figure in the joint resolution, which is the House figure, is entirely too small. I really think it is ridiculously small. Probably it ought to be above the \$100,000 which I have fixed in the amendment; but, in view of the situation, I do not feel justified in offering an amendment to go beyond \$100,000. I do think, however, it ought to be at least that amount.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, several of the mayors of the larger cities, including the mayor of New York, came before the committee urging an increase in this amount, taking the position that with this limit they could not proceed with the character of construction that is required in a thickly populated, high-priced part of the country. On the other hand, we were presented by the artisans and the workmen with objections even to the \$40,000 limit, upon the ground that it was too much. They claimed that we should not

undertake large construction with W. P. A. labor; that that construction should be left to the artisans and to the workmen. There was no change in that figure by the committee as a result of a choice between the two arguments.

I am simply presenting the matter so that the Senate may have the problem as it was before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes appear to have it.

Mr. PEPPER. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which is on the clerk's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "\$100,000,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$123,000,000."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this amendment comes up at a fortunate time. I had become a little impatient, fearing that I should never have an opportunity of offering the amendment; but while I listened to the arguments why the appropriation of \$123,000,000 on the opposite page, page 91, for farm loans, should or should not be made, I felt like moving that that sum be transferred to page 8, where \$100,000,000 is appropriated for the N. Y. A. I was particularly impressed by the argument, both on this side of the Chamber and on the other side of the Chamber, that the recommendations of the President and the Budget Director should be followed. It happens that the same sum of \$123,000,000 was the sum in question; and I trust that the arguments of Senators on the other side of the Chamber and on this side that the recommendation of the President should be followed, and \$123,000,000 should be appropriated, will cause them to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did not the Senator understand me to state that I thought the Budget itself was grossly excessive, and therefore, while I thought nothing should be done over the Budget, I thought reductions should be made wherever they could be made?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I certainly understood that statement; but it seems to me the argument which the Senator from Ohio made at that time is applicable at this time, because this is a project which calls for an increase even more than the other one did; for in the other case the loans are made once for all, while in this case the appropriations for the youth have to be made each year.

The President requested \$123,000,000 to help young people between 16 and 24 years of age, some of them to get their education either in school or in college; some of them to be sent to work, and incidentally to learn how to work. It is conservatively estimated that there are about 2,000,000 young people who want the type of work which the N. Y. A. provides in addition to those who want to be aided in their education.

With an appropriation of \$123,000,000, the N. Y. A. can somewhere near adequately meet that demand, although it will not meet it completely. This will provide the benefits of education and the benefits of work, too.

I have heard in talking with Senators only one objection to this movement, and that is that the students should not have their education paid for by the Government; that they themselves should pay for it. For that reason I want to read just a few figures showing what the Government actually does pay for the students in helping them to get an education.

I will take the figures from my own State, Rhode Island, because that is the one with which I am familiar.

In Rhode Island, about one-half of the youth who are helped by this appropriation are helped in educational ways by having their tuition in school or college partly paid for, and just about one-half receive the other sort of aid, in work. The amounts that they are paid are as follows:

In the school-aid program in secondary schools they are receiving only \$5.63 a month.

In the colleges and universities the college-aid students are earning an average monthly wage of \$11.92.

The graduate students in the colleges, who are receiving the highest amount, receive \$21.13 a month.

Those on the work program receive an average monthly wage of \$19.74 a month.

No one can claim that those students are being pauperized by this amount of Government aid; but it is a fact that those students would not be able to receive the education they are now receiving if they did not receive that additional help from the Federal Government.

Therefore I trust this amount may be increased from the \$100,000,000 recommended in the committee report to the \$123,000,000 recommended by the President and the Budget Director.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the report made by the unemployment census headed by Mr. Biggers some 2 years ago showed that one-third of the unemployed in the country were between the ages eligible for this program?

Mr. GREEN. That is true.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Under the joint resolution as it comes from the House, the amount allocated for this program is a little less than one one-hundred-and-seventeenth of the total amount allocated for the whole program; so that even with an increase of \$23,000,000 it still is not more than one one-hundred-and-fifteenth of the total amount of the program, while one-third of the eligibles for unemployment relief are within the class between the ages of 18 and 24.

Mr. GREEN. That is very true; and to some of us, among whom I include myself, the appeal of youth is the most stirring appeal of all those who need our help, because the future of the country depends on these young men and young women being developed into good citizens. The chance of their being good or bad depends a great deal on the start they get; and, in my opinion, the Government should exert itself to give them a good and a fair start.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I understand that this amendment is to increase the amount for the N. Y. A. from the figure of \$100,000,000 now provided in the joint resolution to \$123,000,000, the amount recommended by the President. Is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. LEE. I am for it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I had intended to ask for the floor in my own right, but the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] has pointed out that one-third of the unemployed are between the ages of 16 and 25. I had the figures and wanted to discuss them; but in view of the fact that the point has been made, I desire to associate myself with the opinion expressed by the Senator from Rhode Island, and add to it, if I may, that the numbers in this particular group not only represent one-third of the unemployed at this time, but, due to the fact that so many young men and young women with no opportunity for employment are leaving the high schools and colleges every day, that number is bound proportionately to increase, in my opinion, rather than decrease.

I am very hopeful the Senate will accept this amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Like the Senator from Connecticut, I wanted to take the floor in my own right to discuss the National Youth Administration, particularly as to its work in my own

State. There are several matters I wanted to discuss, because they have done a most worth-while job in New Mexico; but if the Senator does not object, I should like to present the figures I have here relating to the work in New Mexico. I shall not take the time now to read them, but I ask permission to insert these figures in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—FACTS ON THE N. Y. A. PROGRAM IN NEW MEXICO

The fund allotment for the present fiscal year to the State of New Mexico was \$580,188. Currently a total of 3,271 persons are employed on the works program and the student-aid program, as follows:

Total employment.....	3,271
Works program.....	2,067
All student-aid programs.....	1,204
School aid.....	862
College and graduate aid.....	342
Total number of participating institutions.....	148
Schools.....	141
Colleges and universities.....	7

In New Mexico the earnings of the students receiving N. Y. A. assistance are sufficient to represent the difference between their remaining in school or leaving school because of lack of funds. The students participating in the school-aid program in the secondary schools are receiving an average of \$4.89 a month; in the colleges and universities the college-aid students are earning an average monthly wage of \$10.93; and the graduate-aid students are averaging \$15.71 a month.

On the works program N. Y. A. project workers are receiving an average monthly wage of \$17.24 for 47.5 hours of work per month.

The youth on the N. Y. A. projects are learning to do a great many types of work and are becoming familiarized with working conditions in potential fields of private employment. There is an effort made to relate this work experience to training along the lines of the youth's interests and aptitudes.

In New Mexico N. Y. A. project youth are working in the following major work classifications:

Number of persons employed	
Highways, roads, and streets.....	50
Construction of new buildings.....	126
Remodeling and repairing of public buildings.....	34
Improvement of grounds.....	116
Recreational equipment and facilities (excluding buildings).....	107
Conservation.....	8
Sewing.....	88
Workshops.....	528
Nursery schools.....	37
Resident-training projects.....	247
Recreational-assistance projects.....	214
Clerical projects.....	341
Library service and book repair.....	88
Museum work.....	13
School-lunch projects.....	19
Youth-center activities.....	28
Miscellaneous projects.....	23
Grand total.....	2,067

In New Mexico, there are 1,131 needy, out-of-school, unemployed youth who are certified by the local welfare agency as eligible for N. Y. A. projects and who are awaiting assignment to project work. It is estimated that there are 9,600 young people between the ages of 18 and 24 who are out of school and unemployed needing and wanting the work experience and training provided by the National Youth Administration.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think every member of the committee agrees that the work which has been done by the National Youth Administration has been an excellent work. That work has been done with an appropriation of \$75,000,000. I gather that the Budget estimate has proved of significance at one time and not at another. Some of the Senators are willing to go above the Budget estimate, but not below it.

What the House did—and the House action was followed by the Senate committee—was to divide the difference between the appropriation for last year of \$75,000,000 and the Budget estimate for this year of \$125,000,000. It seemed to the committee that an increase of \$25,000,000 from an appropriation of \$75,000,000 was a liberal and entirely adequate one. In addition to that we have reappropriated the unexpended balances, amounting to some \$2,000,000 more; so

there is practically an increase of \$27,000,000 over the former appropriation of \$75,000,000.

That, in substance, is the attitude of the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to call the attention of the Senator to a report which I have here from the N. Y. A., that in Florida there are 5,446 needy, out of school, unemployed youths who have been certified by the local welfare agency as eligible for N. Y. A. projects, and who are awaiting assignment to project work, which is dependent upon there being additional funds available.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, one thing I think perhaps ought to be added. Of the \$75,000,000 expended in the past year, there was expended for school help \$22,000,000. That is the amount and the proportion that was expended for aiding young men in school. Fifty-three million dollars, or the balance, was expended for projects. We asked the type of projects, and they were all types of projects—ditch digging and every other type. The work is similar to that of the W. P. A. in its character, except with the age limits running from 18 to 25.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not true that involved in the percentage which the Senator has just mentioned were those who were engaged in vocational training?

Mr. ADAMS. I think not. I think that was all included in the educational part. I am making no complaint; I am merely stating to the Senate the facts presented to the committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I can give the Senator the figures. When the appropriation of \$123,000,000—

Mr. ADAMS. I am interested only in the figures as to what the administration spent out of the \$75,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. The proportion is almost the same.

Mr. ADAMS. They testified before the House committee that if they got \$123,000,000 they would add \$5,000,000 to the amount for education. When they came before us, they said that in view of the fact that some of the House Members were a little dissatisfied with that they proposed that they would take more of it for education.

Mr. GREEN. They provide part-time employment and educational opportunities for the 460,000 needy young people to enable them to continue in schools and colleges and universities, and adequate work experience and training on public projects for 350,000 young people who are out of school and unemployed. That is the relative proportion, 460,000 in the field of education, and 350,000 engaged in what is called out-of-school work.

Mr. ADAMS. Those out of school and at work receive more per month than those in school.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. But the actual proportion in dollars was \$22,000,000 for education and \$53,000,000 for out-of-school work.

Mr. GREEN. My figures show the number of those helped.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. There is no question about that feature. The only question is whether or not Congress wishes to draw any line as to expenses. If we should go to the point of saying that just because a certain work is desirable we ought to go the limit, and merely say to the Department "What do you want?" the money of this Government would not last 3 years.

Mr. GREEN. It is not what the Department wants, it is what the youth of this country want. Even the amount proposed will not take care of those already certified. It provides for perhaps 200,000 during the present year getting jobs, but the number who need the help are far greater than the number who will get the jobs. The number will increase year by year unless the trend changes, and we

will have to appropriate more year by year if we are to look after these young people. It does the same sort of work the C. C. C. does in a different way. It prevents the young men going to the bad on the streets. The C. C. C. has captured the public imagination. I believe the N. Y. A. does equally good work, but it has not yet captured the public imagination; so we hesitate about giving them the increase they need.

Mr. ADAMS. So far as we know, there has been no question as to the desirability of the work. Those in touch with it have been enthused by it. There is merely the one question, as to how much the Government this year should appropriate for that work, how large an increase there should be. Last year the President recommended \$75,000,000, and that was appropriated. This year the recommendation went to \$123,000,000, and the House of Representatives felt that \$100,000,000 would represent a fair increase.

I am not speaking in opposition, other than to say that the Committee on Appropriations felt that the compromise reached by the House was a fair, a reasonable, and an adequate appropriation under existing conditions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question about the difference in the appropriation.

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Can the Senator inform me as to whether the separation of the departments resulted in the National Youth Administration losing funds which it formerly received from the Works Progress Administration?

Mr. ADAMS. I think perhaps they are losing, not funds but perhaps some assistance; that is, formerly the Youth Administration was a part of the W. P. A., and to a certain extent they receive perhaps the benefit of the statistical services and other services of the W. P. A., but there is no loss in the funds. There may have been a countervailing service rendered to the W. P. A. by the Youth Administration.

Mr. HATCH. Somehow I had the impression that the separation would cause additional outlay by the Youth Administration which was not occasioned before because the money was provided by the W. P. A. appropriation.

Mr. ADAMS. There are two things. One is in reference to what the Senator from Rhode Island says. I am still one of those who have hope that conditions are going to be better and that there is going to be less need rather than more need. I have always had faith that the reorganization plan was going to be effective, and that when we changed the departments it would be in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the figures show that there are in the country about 2,000,000 young men and young women, boys and girls, who are eligible for National Youth Administration training, but who cannot get the training because there have not been sufficient funds to give them the training. I desire to emphasize that this whole program of the National Youth Administration is an educational program. It is divided into two divisions, as we know. One is what is called the student aid division, and that is where the National Youth Administration provides money for boys and girls going to high schools, colleges, and universities. The National Youth Administration requires these boys and girls to do a certain amount of work and then pays them the money to enable them to go to the schools and the colleges.

The record shows that these boys and girls who are being helped by the National Youth Administration have made far above the average in their grades in their scholastic standings at the schools and colleges.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wonder if the attention of the Senator has been called to the fact that Mr. Aubrey Williams testified that there are now 997 field positions, but for the 1940 program he contemplates an increase of 1,378 field positions, making a total hereafter of 2,375.

Mr. HILL. For this program to be carried out properly and to be effective requires a great deal of supervision and leadership on the part of the program providing work, under which young men are working on all kinds of different

projects, such as learning machine-shop work, metalwork, foundry work, typewriting and stenography, accounting, book-keeping, filing, construction work, mechanics, nursery technique, engineering, chemistry, home economics. The boys and girls on these different projects not only have the practical work on the project but they are gathered together, so to speak, in classes and given the theoretical side as well as the practical side. It requires a great deal of leadership and supervision to carry out this program.

Mr. DANAHER. To the extent of an increase of 150 percent, obviously. I ask the Senator if he realizes that Mr. Williams also testified, as bearing on the Senator's reference to the youth in the colleges, and the like, that the increase in the cheapest part of the program for such assistance is only \$5,000,000. It was so testified. Does the Senator realize that?

Mr. HILL. The cheapest part, of course, is the chief part. We know some of these boys and girls in colleges and high schools are receiving only five, six, seven, or eight dollars a month. That is a very cheap part of the program, but it is a great educational program, and it is now taking fine, splendid young boys and girls out of idleness and giving them an opportunity not only to work, but to go to school and train and prepare themselves for their life's work. The figures show that the turn-over in this work program is over 10 percent a month, over a hundred percent a year.

We know that the average boy and girl who comes to one of our offices and asks for a position does not know anything about the work, has no particular training, is not qualified for any particular kind of employment. This sort of program, whether it is teaching the boy chemistry, or to be an automobile mechanic, prepares the boy for his life work, it trains him so that he may go out and get a job in private employment. The figures show that is just exactly what is happening. There is a large turn-over, of more than 10 percent a month, of these boys being trained by the Government, preparing themselves so that they may carry on and thereby go out and get employment.

Mr. President, it is the cheapest form of help or assistance the Government is engaged in furnishing today. It costs just one-tenth of what the C. C. C. work costs. We all know how fine the C. C. C. work is, but this work is also fine, and costs just exactly 10 percent of what the C. C. C. work costs. There are some 2,000,000 fine, splendid boys and girls in the United States today who are idle, who are seeking something to do. They are the seed corn of this Nation. We should not permit them to rot; we should give them this opportunity to prepare themselves for work, to prepare themselves to carry on their part in this Nation.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, when the honorable and able committee which is responsible for a \$23,000,000 deficiency in the item now before the Senate acted in this matter, it was manifestly under the influence of the philosophy of the elderly woman who decided that she would for the first time in her life ride on a train. She went to the station and said to the agent, "I want a ticket to Springfield." The agent responded: "There are several Springfields—one in Ohio, one in Illinois, and one in Massachusetts. To which Springfield do you want to go?" She retorted: "To whichever one is the cheapest." [Laughter.]

In her opinion the cost of transportation was more important than destination. In the matter of opening the doors of opportunity to the young people of the United States, destination is more vital than cost. There are now 2,000,000 young men and women in this country who are eligible for enrollment by the N. Y. A., but no accommodations are available to them. Three hundred thousand of these have been certified for enrollment. They are imploring the Government to extend them a helping hand. To their supplication deafened ears must not be turned. If there should be a war, the boys who are among these eligibles would, if necessary, be conscripted and sent into the trenches to fight and perhaps to die for their native land. And the girls among the eligibles for enrollment by the National Youth Administra-

tion would be required to work in factories and fields as substitutes for the boys who had gone to war.

We should expect all of them to be loyal to our flag and the glorious institutions for which it stands.

In return for the loyalty we require of them, we should make it possible for them to obtain employment or acquire an education. The most important asset of this Nation is not the silver that is stored at West Point. It is not the money in the Treasury. It is not the hoarded gold in Kentucky. Our boys and girls are more valuable than all of these combined. Because—

Not gold but only men
Can make a people great and strong;
Men who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long;
Brave men, who work while others sleep,
Who fight while others fly;
They plant a nation's pillars deep
And raise its banners to the sky.

Let us not shut the door of opportunity in the faces of these young men and women. Let us rescue them from the possibility of becoming failures on earth, or the necessity of begging their bread from door to door. By adopting the pending amendment to provide them an additional sum of \$23,000,000 we shall so demonstrate our determination to be just to them in their necessity that they will patriotically and sincerely proclaim:

My country 'tis of thee
Sweet land of liberty
Of thee I sing.

They will wholeheartedly help to plant this Nation's pillars deep and raise its banners to the sky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. NEELY. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "who are in need" and to insert the words "who have been certified as in need of employment and who are qualified and available therefor."

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make effective the provision for veterans' preference. As it is now, the language is "who are in need," and as that has been interpreted it works a disadvantage to the disabled veteran who draws a small income. For instance, the Administration has held that a veteran with a pension of \$15 or \$20 a month is not in need. The amendment changes the provision so as to read "who have been certified as in need of employment" and makes effective the veterans' preference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I tender an amendment which is now on the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, line 3, it is proposed to insert the following sentence: "This section shall not apply to municipal electric plants."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, it clearly appears in the language of section 34 that an effort has been made to prevent any part of W. P. A. funds being used in manufacturing plants which might compete with private industrial operations, but the language is obscure and ambiguous, and I take it that there has been no studied effort on the part of the Senate committee at least to make it impossible to use W. P. A. work in connection with the expansion of electric-light enterprises carried on by a municipal body.

In the Northwest particularly a great many municipal operations are being carried on, which are now in existence,

and it is vitally important that there be nothing in the measure which might be construed as a prohibition against the use of W. P. A. funds in projects associated with that sort of an expansion. It may be that other sections of the country do not care to do this, but in my section of the country, where we have Bonneville and Grand Coulee, this becomes a matter of very vital importance.

I talked to the Senator from Colorado, and he assured me that there was no desire on the part of the Senate committee in charge of the joint resolution to make it possible, by construction of the language, to forbid the use of W. P. A. labor in connection with the expansion of these little plants. They are very small affairs in the West. So I have suggested this language in order to get rid of any ambiguity, and to remove any question which might arise out of an attempt to interpret the act. That is my sole and only purpose in offering the amendment.

I discussed it with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who, I am at liberty to say, authorized me to say he is in favor of it. I believe the amendment, which is proposed merely in the interest of clarification and the removal of any question, should be adopted. It does not expand the bill or add anything to it. It simply allows the little plants in my section, of which there are large numbers, to avail themselves of the opportunity to employ W. P. A. workers on projects embraced in the expansion and operation of small plants.

I urge my brethren of the Senate to adopt the amendment. There is nothing in the amendment which adds anything to the cost. It is a decent, purposeful, worth-while thing. If it be said that the language does not forbid the use of W. P. A. labor on those projects, then, Mr. President, there could be no objection to the amendment, because it merely makes impossible an interpretation of the language to the injury of those little plants of which there are a large number in the Northwest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 7, after the comma, following the word "Service", it is proposed to strike out "\$300,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$600,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to make an explanation, Mr. President. I am glad that the temper of the Senate is such that Senators are willing to listen for one moment to what I regard to be one of the most important provisions in connection with this measure. The purpose of the amendment is to appropriate to the Public Health Service the sum of \$600,000 for the supervisory work which that Department of Government does in connection with public-health projects within the several States.

At the present time in 29 States cooperative community sanitation programs are being carried on by the State public health departments in conjunction with the Federal health service operating Works Progress projects. In 17 States there are malaria-control projects, and they are of vital importance to the health of the people of those States.

In the fiscal year 1937 and in 1938 \$1,300,000 was made available for this purpose to the Public Health Service, to give technical advice and engineering service to carry on these worth-while health programs. In this measure only \$300,000 is allowed.

I submit that any such drastic reduction as that is wholly unjustified, and that its effect will be to dry up and starve every public health project in the United States.

I am merely asking for \$600,000, as compared to an appropriation of \$1,300,000 made for the same purpose in 1937 and 1938. I have here and could give a great many

statistics to the Senate showing the vital importance of these public-health projects. Certainly, the labor that we find on the rolls of the Work Projects Administration, the unskilled labor, can be utilized to better advantage in drainage and public-health projects than in almost any other kind of project. It would be nothing short of criminal now to cut them all off and stifle them by this drastic reduction in the appropriation to the Public Health Service of the United States for the supervisory and technical work.

I beg of the Members of the Senate to consider the importance of this small amount of money proposed to be added to the sum we are appropriating to preserve public-health projects in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the benefit of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

"The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting at the end of section 3 a new subsection reading as follows:

"(e) Loans may also be made under this title to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm personally occupied and operated by him and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon, in cases where the Secretary determines that such refinancing is necessary and will enable the borrower successfully to operate the farm, and that the borrower cannot obtain credit for such refinancing from any other Federal agency or federally incorporated lending institution. Such loans shall comply with all the provisions of this title: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title, but shall not use for such purpose in excess of 10 percent of the funds made available during any fiscal year for the making of loans under this title."

Mr. AUSTIN. A very brief explanation of the amendment seems to be in order. It is germane to that part of the pending joint resolution which is entitled "Department of Agriculture," and which starts out with the words:

In order to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and relief to needy farmers—

And so forth. And then, on page 10, it specifically provides that the funds may be used for "farm-debt adjustment service and making and servicing of loans under this section and prior law."

One of those prior laws is the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and the section which I propose to amend is section 3, which provides:

Loans made under this title shall be in such amount (not in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire—

Notice that word—

to acquire the farm and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon.

And so forth. The point is right on that word "acquire." My amendment provides that "Loans may also be made under this title to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm."

Under this Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as drafted, we have section 4 reading as follows:

In making loans under this title, the amount which is devoted to such purpose during any fiscal year shall be distributed equitably among the several States and Territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy, as determined by the Secretary.

That is the point—"prevalence of tenancy."

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, does the Senator's amendment change that point; and if so, how?

Mr. AUSTIN. It does, in this way:

Provided, however, That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title—

That is what I have just read—

but shall not use for such purpose in excess of 10 percent of the funds made available during any fiscal year for the making of loans under this title.

In other words, this is a very simple arrangement which undertakes to make it possible for the Farm Security Administration to go into those States where they are now unable to allocate funds because of the small amount of farm tenancy. This proposal was recommended by the Farm Security Administration. It was drawn by the Farm Security Administration. It is supported by the Farm Security Administration and by the Farm Bureau Federation. It is fair. It adds no burden onto the country, but it enables the Government to aid to rehabilitate the farmers who have titles which they are going to lose because they must meet the heavy interest demand, and because they are unable to meet it on the due date of these obligations.

It is suggested to me that they are land poor. That is one way of saying the same thing I am saying. They are industrious, they are thrifty, they are honest, they pay as they can, but, as Senators all know, their circumstances have been such that they were obliged to default interest and principal on their farm mortgages.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, who has been seeking recognition.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I think this is a very commendable amendment. However, on page 2, line 1, the language seems to make it necessary for the borrower, before he can avail himself of the benefits of the provision, to prove that he cannot obtain credit from any other Federal agency. Why is it necessary to include that provision?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I understand that that is the policy of the Farm Security Administration, and that it is also the policy under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act. In order that the RECORD may show what that policy is, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD all of section 3 of that act, to which this language refers.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Loans made under this title shall be in such amount (not in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire the farm and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon, and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm.

(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and security given therefor shall—

(1) Provide for the repayment of the loan within an agreed period of not more than 40 years from the making of the loan.

(2) Provide for the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

(3) Provide for the repayment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon, in installments in accordance with amortization schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

(4) Be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon, to protect the security, and to assure that the farm will be maintained in repair, and waste and exhaustion of the farm prevented, and that such proper farming practices as the Secretary shall prescribe will be carried out.

(5) Provide that the borrower shall pay taxes and assessments on the farm to the proper taxing authorities, and insure and pay for insurance on farm buildings.

(6) Provide that upon the borrower's assigning, selling, or otherwise transferring the farm, or any interest therein, without the consent of the Secretary, or upon default in the performance of, or upon any failure to comply with, any covenant or condition contained in such instruments, or upon involuntary transfer or sale, the Secretary may declare the amount unpaid immediately due and payable, and that, without the consent of the Secretary, no final payment shall be accepted, or release of the Secretary's interest be made, less than 5 years after the making of the loan.

(c) Except as provided in paragraph (6) of subsection (b), no instrument provided for in this section shall prohibit the prepayment of any sum due under it.

(d) No provision of section 75, as amended, of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 11, sec. 203; Supp. II, title 11, sec. 203), otherwise applicable in respect of any indebtedness incurred under this title by any

beneficiary thereof, shall be applicable in respect of such indebtedness until such beneficiary has repaid at least 15 percent thereof.

Mr. NORRIS. I think what the Senator says is probably true; but it has occurred to me that before a farmer can avail himself of this provision he must make some negative proof.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. He has to go to the trouble, time, and expense of proving that he has tried this agency, that agency, and the other agency, and that they all turned him down.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not like that part of it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Neither do I.

Mr. NORRIS. I would suggest to the Senator that he leave out that part of the language.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am afraid that would run counter to the policy of the Farm Security Administration. When I talked the matter over with representatives of the Farm Security Administration it was claimed that the Administration did not want to become the reservoir of mortgages now held by the Farm Credit Administration or some other of the lending agencies of the Government and have the whole business dumped onto it.

Mr. NORRIS. Before a farmer can obtain any relief under this provision he must almost prove that he is a pauper and that he cannot obtain relief anywhere else. It seems to me the proof he has to offer has a tendency to show that he is a poor risk.

Mr. AUSTIN. Indeed, this kind of relief is to prevent his becoming a pauper, because he is in great danger of that right now. Many of these defaulted mortgages on farms are under foreclosure at the present time, and this type of relief ought to be granted, but it cannot be. The Farm Security Administration comes in with a very beneficial service. There is a humane side to this question, besides the money side. I refer to the side of the farmer.

Of course, it is also an advantage to a creditor in one respect to go to the debtor and negotiate with him upon a settlement which reduces the debt, reduces the interest, and extends the period of payment for a longer period of time, making it possible for the farmer, who thus far has been unable to make his payments, to do so in the future. So there is a saving to these thrifty people who are merely victims of the bad times through which we have been passing.

Mr. LEE and Mr. MILLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. A portion of the Senator's amendment disturbs me somewhat. I do not know whether it applies to the purchase of farms for farm tenants, or only to refinancing. I am very much in sympathy with the Senator's amendment to make provision for refinancing farm loans which are in distress, because it is just as much of an advantage to save a farmer from becoming a farm tenant as it is to rehabilitate one who is already a tenant.

What disturbs me is that, as I understand, a provision of the Senator's amendment would strike down the only yardstick or criterion by which these loans are to be made in the different States and different sections. The present Bankhead-Jones law provides that these loans shall be made according to the ratio of farm tenancy to farm population, which provides some guide for making the loans. Part of the Senator's amendment, I think, strikes down the theory of the Bankhead-Jones act. If it applied only to refinancing, I would not see any objection to it. However, if it applies to the sale of farms as well as to refinancing, it seems that we ought not to agree to it, unless the Senator has some other provision which will give us a guide for making these loans.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in answer to the learned Senator I assure him that he has misunderstood the amendment. The amendment does not strike down the theory of the Bankhead-Jones Act at all. It leaves section 3 as it was with respect to acquisition. That is dependent upon

the tenancy feature, just as the Senator from Oklahoma wants it to be. That is left undisturbed. The amendment relates solely to adding to section 3 this language:

Loans may also be made under this title to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm personally occupied and operated by him.

That is all. It adds that aid, and it is limited in amount. The amount of money which may be allocated to a State where this condition exists is limited by the proviso:

Provided, however, That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title—

Mr. LEE. Is not section 4 the one which gives the Department the guide, which is the ratio of farm tenancy to farm population?

Mr. AUSTIN. That relates only to allocation to the State. Let me read it:

Sec. 4. In making loans under this title the amount which is devoted to such purpose during any fiscal year shall be distributed equitably among the several States and Territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. LEE. Is that language left in?

Mr. AUSTIN. That language is left in, exactly as it is. It is not changed at all. In those States where that yardstick bars the allocation to them of their equitable ratio of the amount of this appropriation, the proviso comes in to a limited degree, namely, 10 percent:

Provided, however, That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title, but it shall not use for such purposes in excess of 10 percent of the funds made available during any fiscal year for the making of loans under this title.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield further.

Mr. LEE. I am very much in sympathy with the Senator's amendment; and I should like to say that the farm-tenancy bill, which is now on the calendar, has a provision in it for the refinancing of farm mortgages which are in distress.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know about that bill. However, it does not service the social purpose covered by the Farm Security Administration. We want to rehabilitate these families. That can be done by giving attention to them directly, going to the family and discovering what will aid the family to produce a better income with which to retire the debt. That is one aspect of this service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall take time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized on the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to refer to the proviso in the amendment, making a limitation of 10 percent of the funds made available in one fiscal year. Personally I think the Senator is to be congratulated upon the amendment. I think it will serve a very useful purpose in every State in the Union. It will reach a class of people who cannot be reached in any other way of which I know. Neither the Federal land bank nor any other agency is reaching them. I refer to a class of people who are going on relief daily and constantly. Unless relief is granted, I do not know what is going to become of them. I wonder why the Senator limited the amount of loans to 10 percent of the appropriation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall be quite frank about that. It was believed that those States which now enjoy a larger allocation by virtue of the limitation with respect to prevalence of farm tenancy might object if more than 10 percent were diverted to other States in trying to allocate an equitable amount. However, since the appropriation has been increased tonight, I feel certain that that objection cannot possibly be made on any rational basis.

Mr. MILLER. I think it would be a short-sighted policy for any State to object, because the thing which is creating farm

tenancy in this country is the inability of the small landowner to obtain a loan.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont made reference to the fact that the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration had been increased tonight. I voted for that increase. I think it was deserved. However, not one dollar of that money can be used for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. The appropriation for the purpose of enabling tenant farmers to purchase farms, and which would be available for the purposes of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont in the event that amendment is adopted, was carried in the agricultural appropriation bill. Senators will recall that the Senate amended that bill to appropriate the full amount of the authorization of \$50,000,000 for that purpose for the coming fiscal year. The conferees on the part of the Senate supported the Senate position as valiantly as they knew how. We insisted that the House conferees take that amendment back for a separate vote in the House. The House voted it down by a substantial vote. When the action of the House was reported to the Senate, the Senate again insisted on its amendment and threw the matter into conference once more.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know whether or not I surrendered the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator did; and the Chair recognized the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator in my time.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask the Senator how he interprets the language on page 10 of the pending measure:

The sums provided in this section shall be available—

Now, come down to line 7:

for farm-debt adjustment service and making and servicing of loans under this section and prior law.

As a lawyer I cannot see why that does not refer directly to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act as prior law. Throughout the provision entitled "Department of Agriculture", we find direct references to it, particularly on page 11, where it is provided that:

The Farm Security Administration within the Department of Agriculture is hereby extended until June 30, 1940,

Why?

to carry out the purposes of this section.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the very reason why I do not think the funds voted here tonight are available for the purpose of making loans on land. True it is that they are available for the purpose of making loans, and that is the chief function of the Farm Security Administration, but the loans referred to in section (b) are loans which are made to farmers to enable them to make crops, and to purchase livestock and farming implements and things of that nature, and personal property, and do not pertain to the real-estate loans which are provided for in title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

By some strange construction or perhaps by some logical construction of the language pointed out by the Senator from Vermont, loans might be made on land; but undoubtedly the references here are to the loans which are made on personal property, and which are made to farmers to enable them to subsist and live during the period in which they are making crops and do not apply to the farm-tenant loans.

I have no quarrel with the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. It will doubtless serve a useful purpose. I do think the sum of \$40,000,000, which has just been agreed to in the agricultural appropriation bill, is woefully inadequate for the purpose of dealing with the farm-tenancy program or with the problem of refinancing loans of the type the Senator from Vermont has described. I put the House conferees on notice that if it was possible to do so in any deficiency bill I intended to offer again an amendment

appropriating the \$10,000,000 that the Senate heretofore has voted, to bring this appropriation up to the full amount of the authorization of \$50,000,000; and I therefore offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment, appropriating the \$10,000,000 authorized by law for the purpose of making these loans to tenant farmers to enable them to purchase farms. These funds will also be available for the purpose sought by the Senator from Vermont in his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont the following:

There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of said Bankhead-Jones Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the relief joint resolution been laid aside and the Bankhead-Jones bill been taken up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, we seem to have before us an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act and then another amendment appropriating money to carry out the Bankhead-Jones Act. I do not know anything about the merits of the thing. It seems to me, however, that the relief joint resolution ought in some way to be confined to provisions bearing upon relief.

This amendment starts out:

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting at the end of section 3 a new subsection, reading as follows—

Then I gather that my fellow member of the Appropriations Committee has a provision adding \$10,000,000 for the operation of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am merely restoring the \$10,000,000 which was twice voted in the Senate, but which we have never been able to get the House to agree to.

Mr. ADAMS. In the Bankhead-Jones Act, or in the relief joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am offering it as an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. ADAMS. Which is an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is. It is in order, however.

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, it is in order in a purely parliamentary sense.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. LEE. If we are able to take a farm family off W. P. A. and put them on a farm that they have a chance to buy, and make the farm purchase itself, that is relief; and if we are able to keep a farm family from losing their farm and going on W. P. A., is not that relief?

Mr. ADAMS. Does the Senator from Oklahoma seriously contend that in the passage of a great relief measure we ought to go back into some other farm bill which is pending before the Agricultural Committee, and has not been reported out from that committee, just because it is a good bill?

I think the Senate ought to exercise a little discretion in handling this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr.

AUSTIN], as amended. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BURKE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Frazier	Lee	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Lodge	Reynolds
Bankhead	Green	Lucas	Russell
Barkley	Guffey	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Gurney	McKellar	Slattery
Bone	Hale	Maloney	Smathers
Bridges	Harrison	Mead	Stewart
Bulow	Hatch	Miller	Taft
Burke	Hayden	Minton	Tobey
Byrd	Herring	Murray	Townsend
Capper	Hill	Neely	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Norris	Vandenberg
Connally	Holt	Nye	Walsh
Danaher	Hughes	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wiley
Ellender	La Follette	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The yeas and nays have been requested by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] on his amended amendment. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before concerning my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], I withhold my vote. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is paired on this question with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. If present, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the negative). My general pair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], would vote as I have voted; so I will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—43

Austin	Bone	Connally	Frazier
Bankhead	Bridges	Danaher	Guffey
Barkley	Bulow	Davis	Gurney
Bilbo	Capper	Ellender	Hayden

Hill
Holman
Holt
La Follette
Lee
McCarran
Maloney

Mead
Miller
Minton
Murray
Neely
Norris
Nye

O'Mahoney
Pepper
Reed
Reynolds
Russell
Schwellenbach
Slattery

Smathers
Stewart
Tobey
Truman
Wheeler
Wiley

NAYS—19

Adams
Burke
Byrd
Clark, Mo.
Gerry

Green
Hale
Hatch
Herring
Hughes

Johnson, Colo.
Lodge
Lucas
McKellar
Radcliffe

Taft
Townsend
Vandenberg
Walsh

NOT VOTING—34

Andrews
Ashurst
Bailey
Barbour
Borah
Brown
Byrnes
Caraway
Chavez

Clark, Idaho
Donahay
Downey
George
Gibson
Gillette
Glass
Harrison
Johnson, Calif.

King
Logan
Lundeen
McNary
Overton
Pittman
Schwartz
Sheppard
Shipstead

Smith
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Tydings
Van Nuys
Wagner
White

So Mr. AUSTIN's amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 18, line 6, to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$75,000." In the amount of money appropriated, the amendment is the same as the one I offered awhile ago which was defeated by a tie vote on a division, except that the amount was \$100,000 then instead of \$75,000. This does not change the amount appropriated in the joint resolution at all.

I have talked with Colonel Harrington about the effect of this \$40,000 limitation, and he says it will disrupt the building program of the W. P. A. in every State of the Union. I know it will in my State, and I am sure it will in all the States. I think the Senate feels that \$40,000 is too little as a limitation, because even with the State or the locality putting up 25 percent of the total cost, it means that the outside limitation on the construction of any commodious high-school building in any community of any size would be limited to about \$50,000 or \$52,000. It is not enough. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 2, after the period it is proposed to insert the following:

If the person filing such affidavit was not born in the United States, the affidavit shall contain a statement as to the time, place, and manner of his entry into the United States and the time and place of his acquisition of said citizenship by naturalization.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on page 22, beginning in line 20, we find the following language:

(e) No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship.

The amendment would merely be a further assurance on the part of the Government that only duly qualified American citizens should be provided with work under the terms of the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 18, before the period, it is proposed to insert "or to any person who participates in any activity the subject matter of which relates to the overthrow of such Government through force or violence."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this is in reference to the matter we had under discussion this afternoon in regard

to communistic activities in the W. P. A. In other words, anyone who participates in activities of the sort mentioned in the amendment would not be entitled to employment under W. P. A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 24, to strike out the word "and" and to insert a comma after the word "recreational", and to strike out the word "work" and the semicolon following the said word "work"; in line 25, to insert a comma after that part of the word "production" which appears in line 25; to strike out the words "of goods for distribution to the needy" and the semicolon following the word "needy" and to insert a comma after the word "service" appearing in line 25, to strike out the words "to the"; and on page 4, line 1, to strike out the word "needy" and the comma following that word.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in explanation of the amendment, I will merely say that striking out the words and making the corrections I have suggested in the amendment restores the language of existing law. In the bill as prepared by the House, I think, striving to strike at the theater project and the art project, a change was made in the language which does and will interfere with work rather than the projects which were sought to be affected. The amendment which I offer merely restores the language of the existing law.

I conferred with the Senator from Colorado earlier in the day, and at that time he agreed as I understood to take the amendment to conference. I am perfectly willing to rely upon the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was interested in offering an amendment, and I am anxious to know whether it is not covered perhaps by what the Senator has offered. I propose at the bottom of page 3, after the word "needy," to offer an amendment providing "including men, women, or children receiving treatment or maintenance from charity or from any charitable institution."

Mr. HATCH. One of the purposes of the amendment is to cover cases of that kind.

Mr. PEPPER. They will be covered, and goods from the W. P. A. can be distributed under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few minutes on the joint resolution itself. I intend to vote for it, but I do not like to vote for it without explaining that I do not approve of the principle of the measure—that I think relief ought to be returned to the States. I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a bill presenting a system which I believe should be adopted, and have it printed as a part of my remarks, it being the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and myself, presenting substantially the plan which was presented as an amendment to the Byrnes bill earlier in the session.

I do not like to vote against the pending measure because we have a serious relief problem.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did I understand the Senator to say that he is against the joint resolution in principle?

Mr. TAFT. I say I am against the principle of the administration of work relief by the Federal Government; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then why is the Senator going to vote for the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Because we face a situation in which a very large number of men—2,000,000 men—will be thrown out of work on the 1st of July unless we take this action now, because it is impossible to change the system except after a very considerable time. The bill which I present proposes that the system be changed on the 1st of July 1940, because it requires the States to adopt a plan of relief which must be approved by the Federal Government, and under which the Federal Government will extend aid to the States to the extent of 66½ percent of the total cost of work relief and direct relief, just as it extends aid for old-age pensions and other uses under the Social Security Act.

In the meantime, until that system can be adopted, I see no alternative except to proceed with the present system.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator has such a fine plan all worked out, why did he not introduce it some months ago, when there would have been some hope of getting it adopted?

Mr. TAFT. Substantially this bill was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] almost the very first day of the session. The committee has not seen fit to give consideration to any such change in plan. We think we have somewhat perfected the bill. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and myself have joined in presenting at the present time a bill which I hope will be considered at this session, because, as I have said, it will take nearly a year to get the necessary State legislation and the necessary plans if we are to have administration by the States.

Mr. HATCH. Did I understand the Senator to say that he proposes that the Federal Government shall contribute toward the payment of direct relief in the States?

Mr. TAFT. I propose that the work relief and direct relief be one plan, and that the Federal Government contribute approximately 66½ percent of the total cost of work relief and direct relief to the States; yes.

Mr. HATCH. Then the Senator proposes to destroy the principle we have now established, that the Federal Government shall contribute only toward the employment of persons who can work?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I propose to destroy that distinction. It is a distinction which never should have been made. There is no real distinction between employables and unemployables; and the Federal Government has never carried out the principle laid down originally, that it would employ all employables. There is no distinction. The two ought to be administered together. They should work together, and they should also work together with the unemployment-insurance divisions which are operated by the States. There should be one single administration if we are to have effective relief, and, in my opinion, the Federal Government, if it is to carry out such a system, must contribute the money.

I think relief is a local problem, but I recognize the fact that the localities and the States have no means of taxation sufficient to provide adequate funds. So we must assist them, as we must assist them in the case of old-age pensions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the cost of direct relief in the United States is about equal to the cost of work relief.

Mr. TAFT. No; I think the cost of work relief is very high. The cost of direct relief is less than 50 percent of the cost of work relief today. I do not know whether if work relief were properly administered, it would not be almost as much, but my impression is that today it is less than 50 percent of the cost of direct relief. The result is that what we are doing today is to make the States contribute 25 percent for the cost of work relief and the whole cost of direct relief, so that today the localities, under the present system, are forced to pay nearly half of the total cost of all relief.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then the Senator's plan proposes to transfer what is now a local burden to the Federal Government. How would he save any money?

Mr. TAFT. I think the administration of relief by localities will be infinitely more economical. There is no city council in this country, there is no State legislature in this country, with the utter lack of financial responsibility demonstrated by this body tonight. There is not another body in this country that I know of which will vote millions and millions of money when they do not know where the money is coming from, when they cannot think of a system of taxation which will provide the money they are spending. If the administration of relief is so changed that the localities will have the responsibility for administering the relief, and providing a percentage of the funds, it will be an infinitely more economical administration. There will be less money spent by the Federal Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator spoke of the bill in substance having been prepared very early in the session—I believe in January—and introduced. Has there been the slightest effort upon the part of anyone to bring it out of the Committee on Appropriations, so far as the Senator knows?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is a matter for the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] also introduced a similar bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did it go to our committee?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know to which committee it was referred. The President himself has reiterated that he is entirely opposed to the principle, and apparently so long as the present administration is in power the possibility of adopting this system is not worth the effort, practically, of insisting upon the adoption of the plan by a committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wanted to let that be understood.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand the Byrnes committee has also considered the problem. It has not met their approval, and they have refused to go ahead with any serious consideration of such plans.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to ask one other question. The Senator from Ohio, I understand, says he does not know to what committee this matter was referred. Is that correct? He does not know before what committee it has been pending during all the present session?

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Byrnes Committee on Unemployment Relief has been considering it, but has not given it serious consideration.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] himself is opposed to this system, and wrongfully, I think. I think he confuses public works with relief. I do not think they ought to be confused. I think relief is one thing and public works another.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suppose the Senator has asked for a hearing before the Byrd committee?

Mr. TAFT. No; I have no bill pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then to what bill is the Senator referring?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] offered a bill as an amendment, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] also offered a bill. All three of us joined in offering amendments to the Byrnes bill when it was before the Senate, which we would have pressed had the Byrnes bill not been laid aside at that time because of the reorganization. I have now proposed a bill which was offered as an amendment to the Byrnes bill at that time. The bill is a combination of two previous bills and one or two additional ideas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Ohio is against the Federal Government administering direct work or work relief as a Federal proposal entirely?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. But he is in favor of a bill which would make the States do it, and require the approval of the Fed-

eral Government, and also make the Federal Government pay two-thirds of the cost?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Two-thirds for the present. I should hope that as the problem grew less the amount might be lowered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator said awhile ago that direct relief, which is now borne by the localities, is as large as the Works Progress Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. No; I said I thought it was less than 50 percent. In my own locality, with which I am familiar, it is only 25 or 30 percent of the cost of W. P. A.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that be true, the Federal Government would be paying about as much under the new plan as it pays now.

Mr. TAFT. If relief and work relief are coordinated under one local administration which is determined to carry out the language in an economical way to suit the will of the people of their own district, instead of suiting the will of some national body and a lot of pressure groups, I say that then the total cost would be much less, and that I would hope that the Federal Government contribution might be less.

Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senator would neither save money nor save Federal participation. About all he would save would be to get his name on the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I would make a fundamental change in the whole matter of relief. I hope it would be infinitely more satisfactory.

Mr. President, I will say that if the Senator thinks the Federal Government is going to continue the administration of direct relief for many years to come he is very much mistaken. I do not think the people approve of it. I do not think it is a proper method of administering relief.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did I understand the Senator from Ohio to say that he did not favor Federal administration of relief?

Mr. TAFT. That is what I said.

Mr. PEPPER. And then did I understand the Senator to say that the purpose of the relief plan which he introduced contemplated the Federal Government contributing 66 2/3 percent of the cost of the projects and the local community one-third? Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. In dealing with projects, the Federal Government would contribute two-thirds of the total cost of relief and work relief, leaving to the local locality the direct relief they might have. I may say that the apportionment plan between the States, which is somewhat similar to the apportionment plan that was in the bill before it was taken out by the Senate committee, is to make sure that no State will get an excessive percentage.

I may say that the plan provides further that the administration in each State must be under civil-service rules, and that it must conform to certain minimum standards.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Federal Government have any supervision over the construction program in the several States?

Mr. TAFT. None whatever, except that it must conform, as I said, to some fixed qualifications which the State plan must have. This in effect is similar to the unemployment-insurance plan. The State must adopt a plan and must conform to that plan. If it departs from that plan, the Federal Government may withhold the payment of money just as they may in the case of unemployment insurance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. At the present time Cook County is paying for direct relief at the rate of \$4,000,000 per month. Under the Senator's plan would the Federal Government take care of two-thirds of that \$4,000,000 by transferring the proper sum to the State authorities and then having them pay it to the municipalities?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. They would add to that the total sum of work relief, which, I suppose, in Chicago may

run to seven or eight million dollars a month. I should think it would be about \$8,000,000 a month, which would make \$12,000,000 a month, which would make the total cost of relief in Chicago nearly \$150,000,000 a year.

I should say that if the city of Chicago were willing to put up \$40,000,000 the Federal Government would put up \$80,000,000, to enable the city to carry out its complete relief plan, providing it did not exceed the total allocation of the State of Illinois, which is provided by the Federal appropriation, and which, of course, may be changed from year to year.

Mr. LUCAS. That is hardly the question. What I was trying to ascertain was whether or not the Senator's plan would cost the Federal Government more, providing it had to put up two-thirds of \$4,000,000 that is now being contributed by the taxpayers direct per month for direct relief.

Mr. TAFT. I would say that in the city of Cleveland, which I know more about, the Federal Government last year was spending in the neighborhood of about \$50,000,000 for W. P. A. The city of Cleveland was spending about \$12,000,000 more, or a total of \$62,000,000. The best authorities in social work that I could find in the city of Cleveland felt that if they had a single administration of relief in Cleveland they could do the whole job for \$40,000,000, in which case the Federal contribution would have been two-thirds, or about \$26,000,000, instead of approximately twice that sum. I say the present method of administering, according to any social worker one may talk to, is the most expensive method of administering relief that we have had in the United States, and we have had some six different methods since the depression of 1929 began.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I am looking to 1940. I do not think the Senator ought to monopolize this bill all to himself, or along with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I wonder if he would not take in my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to do so.

The bill introduced by Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. TAFT (S. 2721) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for grants to States for direct relief and work relief was read twice by its title, referred to the Special Committee on Unemployment and Relief, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XII—GRANTS TO STATES FOR DIRECT RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States Government to discontinue on July 1, 1940, the administration of direct relief and work relief (which shall not be construed to include the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps) and to assist thereafter only in financing the administration of such relief by the States and the local subdivisions thereof. The Administrator shall cooperate with the States and local subdivisions and assist them to set up the necessary records, personnel, and organization to handle work relief, and on July 1, 1940, he shall discontinue the direct administration of relief.

"(a) The term "needy individual" means any person who lacks self-support and who lacks resources from which may be derived support adequate to provide a reasonable standard of subsistence compatible with decency and health for such individual and for persons legally dependent upon such individual living in the same household, and includes such persons legally dependent upon such individual living in the same household.

"(b) The term "States" shall include the District of Columbia and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 1202. For the purpose of enabling each State to extend and improve, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, plans for providing financial assistance, including both direct relief and work relief, to needy individuals not otherwise receiving assistance or benefits as referred to in titles I, II, III, IV, and X of this act, or for whom the assistance or benefits received as referred to in such titles is inadequate to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the sum of \$1,250,000,000, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year thereafter a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States

which have submitted, and had approved by the Board, State plans for such services.

"Sec. 1203. A State plan for direct relief and work relief within the meaning of this act must—

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;

"(2) provide for financial participation by the State, or by political subdivisions thereof, or by both, in the cost of such relief;

"(3) either provide for the administration of the plan by a single permanent State agency or provide for the administration of the plan by agencies of political subdivisions within the State, supervised by such single permanent State agency; and shall provide that such State agency be directed and controlled by a relief board of not less than five persons, no more than a bare majority of whom shall be members of any one political party;

"(4) provide that all officials (except board members) and employees of such State agency, and of all agencies of political subdivisions administering the plan, shall be selected and protected in their tenure of office by civil-service laws of the States;

"(5) provide that the State agency and the agencies of political subdivisions within the State will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the board may from time to time require;

"(6) Provide that there shall be no unreasonable discrimination between needy individuals within the jurisdiction of the State, and particularly no discrimination on account of race or color;

"(7) Provide for the periodic reexamination and reconsideration of all individuals receiving direct relief or work relief under the plan;

"(8) Provide that the State agency may enter into reciprocal agreements with the appropriate agencies in other States for the care, treatment, and redomiciling of transient needy individuals; and

"(9) Provide the exact manner in which the share of the State or the subdivisions, or both, shall be paid into the relief fund.

"(b) The Board shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that it shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for work relief under the plan—

"(1) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for 1 year immediately preceding the application; or

"(2) Any citizenship requirement which excludes any citizen of the United States.

"Sec. 1204. (A) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan under this title for each quarter beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1940, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as financial assistance, equal to two-thirds of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as financial assistance by the State and the political subdivisions therein under the State plan, in which expenditures shall be counted—

"(1) payments of direct relief, both in cash and in kind, with respect to needy individuals who at the time such payments were made were not inmates of any public institution; and

"(2) the ascertained cost of all work-relief projects on which only needy individuals (other than supervisors) are employed, and 80 percent of all expenditures are direct payments to such needy individuals: *Provided, however,* That the total amount paid to any State for any quarter shall not exceed such State's quota as calculated under paragraph (B) (1) of this section.

"(B) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) The Board shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, fix the total amount which it will distribute during such quarter to all the States out of the amount or amounts appropriated by Congress for the entire fiscal year; it shall then calculate the quota of each State for such quarter by apportioning 90 percent or more of the amount it has fixed for all the States, among the several States in the following manner:

"(a) One-third in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census;

"(b) One-third in the ratio which the number of unemployed individuals in each State bears to the total number of such individuals in all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census of unemployment, including the unemployment census of 1937, or by the latest available statistics with respect to unemployment supplied by Federal or State agencies.

"(c) One-third in the ratio which the prevailing average of wage rates as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor in each State bears to the prevailing average of wage rates for all of the States as similarly determined.

"(2) A sum not to exceed 10 percent of the amount or amounts appropriated by Congress for the entire fiscal year may be apportioned among the States or local subdivisions thereof by the Board without regard to any limitations as to amount or percentage prescribed by this title: *Provided,* That such apportionment shall be made only among such States or local subdivisions which have made written application therefor, and only when the Board, after a complete hearing, finds that by reason of disaster, or extraordinary conditions of unemployment, or extraordinary conditions of inability to finance relief, such States or local subdivisions are unable to provide adequate relief within their boundaries, and the President approves such findings.

"(3) The Board shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, estimate the amount to be paid to the State for such quarter under subsection (A) of this section, but not exceeding the quota fixed under paragraph (B) (1) of this section, plus such sum as may be apportioned under paragraph (B) (2), such estimate to be based on (a) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter; and if such amount is less than one-third of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived; (b) records showing the number of needy individuals in the State; and (c) such other investigation as the Administrator may find necessary.

"(4) The Board shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by it, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under this act for such quarter, except to the extent that such sum has been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the Board for such prior quarter.

"(5) The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Board, the amount so certified.

"Sec. 1205. In the case of any State plan for financial assistance under this title which has been approved by the Board, if the Board, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds:

"(1) That the plan has been so changed as to impose any residence, citizenship, or other requirement for relief prohibited by section 3 of this title, or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1203 of this title to be included in the plan; the Board shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until the Board is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer so imposed, and that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until it is so satisfied it shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, is the presentation of an amendment in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. BONE. I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 20, after the word "insect" it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "plant and fungus."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, throughout the forests of the West, and I suspect through most of the timbered sections of the United States, the W. P. A. has carried on certain operations dealing with what is commonly known as blister rust. It has been a recognized activity of W. P. A., and that is particularly true in California, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

The purpose of inserting this language is merely to make sure that the handling of blister rust in the forests of the West, especially in the national forests, will not be interfered with, and that it may be continued under W. P. A. operations as a recognized project.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will again be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 20, after the word "insect" it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "plant and fungus."

Mr. BONE. I may say that the language of the measure permits the fighting of insect pests, but the fungus that attacks the trees out there, which is known as blister rust, is not an insect pest.

Mr. McCARRAN. May I ask the Senator from Washington whether or not embraced within the term "fungus" there is contemplated the fungus that attacks other plants aside from the trees in the Northwest?

Mr. BONE. I think the term "fungus" is broad enough to include the entire category of fungi. I would assume that to

be true. I think it is broad enough as it would be interpreted to include any legitimate handling of that sort of pests. I do not doubt that it will. I think the language I employ there is sufficiently broad to cover it.

Mr. McCARRAN. What I have in mind, I will say for the purpose of the Record, is that we are throughout the West now contending with a pest known as the alfalfa fungi, and I wondered if the Senator had that in mind when he offered the amendment, or whether he considered that the amendment embraced it.

Mr. BONE. I assume that this work will be done on public lands, and I am not certain whether or not the Senator from Nevada had in mind doing that class of work on private lands. I have in mind the great public forests in the West in which these operations are now being carried on very extensively.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have in mind, I will say to the Senator from Washington, the semi-public land embraced within public or Federal reclamation projects.

Mr. BONE. If it is any form of fungus, I think the language is broad enough to cover it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$7,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment for the reason that it is in conformity with the request of the Bureau of the Budget, and I recognize the fact that many Senators in the course of the evening's debate have left with us the thought that we ought to be guided to a very great extent by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Has the Senator from New York followed that program himself?

Mr. MEAD. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that at the time the Senator was making his strong and forceful argument I was in his corner.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered increases from \$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000 the amount of the appropriation for the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration. This amount was recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. I read from page 155 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations the following statement:

Now, I would like to say just a word in regard to Puerto Rico. The economic situation has become progressively worse in Puerto Rico. The sugar quota has hit Puerto Rico very hard. The trade agreements have hit Puerto Rico very hard, and that leaves a situation for which the Federal Government is responsible.

Secretary Ickes recommends that with the following language:

There is one item I should like to call particular attention to. The Bureau of the Budget set up \$10,000,000 for Puerto Rico, for the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration. Puerto Rico must depend upon this appropriation not only for its agricultural relief, but for its urban relief as well.

On page 248 of the hearings there is a statement which goes on to relate the experiences of the island in its attempt to obtain works-progress projects.

The following statement was made by one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee:

We have found it impossible to get the W. P. A. to come down into Puerto Rico to set up W. P. A. projects. Governor Winship time and time again asked the W. P. A. to set up projects, and the Administration felt that it could not do so.

Mr. President, this appropriation, recommended as it was by the Secretary of the Interior, recommended as it has been by the Bureau of the Budget, is essential because of depressed

economic conditions today in Puerto Rico. This organization is now employing about 35,000 people. The appropriations contained in the joint resolution will effect a reduction of that number to 15,000. Last year this agency had \$13,500,000. That sum was made up of the appropriation contained in the legislation, plus the unexpended balance and plus the balance which remained in a revolving fund. Today there is only \$150,000 in the unexpended balance, and we are providing only \$7,000,000, a reduction of \$3,000,000 from the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and from the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary of the Interior attempted to impress the committee with the desperate plight of the island. He pointed out that he was extremely concerned, and wanted the full appropriation, and yet the committee evidently did nothing about it.

So, Mr. President, I offer the amendment; and I trust it will meet with the approval of the Senate.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations heard the testimony of the Secretary. We had the same testimony at a previous hearing. The House committee heard the testimony not only of the Secretary but of the representative of the island, and the appropriation included in the joint resolution was in an amount which the committees of both Houses felt to be adequate.

I think one item in the statement of the Secretary ought to be noted. I think perhaps the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is better equipped to answer the question than I. I refer to the statement that Puerto Rico is suffering by reason of the Sugar Act. As a matter of fact, Puerto Rico is receiving about \$10,000,000 a year in benefit payments by reason of the Sugar Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on page 39, under section 34, an amendment was offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] which reads as follows:

This section shall not apply to municipal electrical plants.

That particular paragraph in this measure was put forward by the Appropriations Committee so that no funds should be used in a plant, factory, or mill which might come into competition with private business. I think the amendment was put through in pretty rapid fashion, without due explanation. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. NORRIS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] offered this amendment he said there was doubt that it would prevent the building of a municipal electric-lighting plant if a municipality wanted to build such a plant with assistance from any Federal agency. The fact that the Senator from New Hampshire moves to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is a demonstration that the doubt was well-founded.

Mr. President, if the Senate wants to put in a prohibition preventing the use of any instrumentality under this joint resolution, such as the labor which will be employed, in the construction of a municipal lighting plant, municipal water plant, or a municipal sewage-disposal plant, the Senate ought to support the Senator's motion to reconsider.

It is safe to say that the only thing he has in mind is to take the amendment out so that it will be impossible, if his

view of the law is correct, to build a municipal lighting plant. What is the difference between a municipality which votes to take advantage of any provision of the law in building a municipal lighting plant and any other agency which seeks to take advantage of the law?

I had intended to offer a similar amendment until I talked with the Senator from Washington, and it was agreed that he should offer it. I talked with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] about it, and he said he would not object to the amendment. It was agreeable to him because the real intent of the language in this section was that it should not apply to a municipal lighting plant. I have entire sympathy with that intention.

The amendment reads:

No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the State or local government agency from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories—

That far, as I see it, there could be no objection to the prohibition. That far, it would perform a useful service. However, the following words are added:

or plants which would manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products other than those derived from the first processing of agricultural products, in competition with existing industries.

Some testimony was offered by several representatives of the Government on the question whether or not that language would prohibit building a municipal electric-light plant; or, if a municipality had a privately owned water plant that was supplying water, whether or not the municipality could build a municipally owned plant under this section. The testimony of Mr. Fortas explains it. He says:

Section 301—

That is section 34, the one to which this amendment applies—

which is on page 33 of the committee print—

That was a different print from the one we have—

and page 35 of the bill as passed by the House, provides that no funds appropriated in this joint resolution shall be used to purchase, establish, or expand mills or factories or plants which will manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products in competition with existing industries.

Now, it is my understanding that the origin of this provision is in the first deficiency bill passed this year, and that the provision is in a narrower form and that it was made applicable to the W. P. A. to meet a specific situation where the W. P. A. funds were being used to build competing mills and factories, and the Congress desired to stop that.

This language originated in the first deficiency bill of this year. We did not want that situation to continue. We did not want to get into competition with mills and factories privately owned. We did not want this money to be used to go into that kind of business. In the joint resolution the words "or plants" were added. Those words do not add anything. They are unnecessary. The whole idea is expressed without them.

Mr. Fortas continues:

The provision as presently drafted is applicable to P. W. A. and W. P. A.; we could not do any work on any plant that appears in section 301 or in that whole provision.

He goes on to enumerate various things, such as a sewer system, a water system, or a plant which possibly might compete with an existing industry.

For example, if you had a city which had a private water system that was obsolete and the charges were excessively high and they wanted to put in a modern water system, we might not be able to do work under this provision.

And the same is true of public power development.

That is the secret of it. Nobody objects to the rest of it. The words "or plants" would not be in the joint resolution and they would not be defended by the Senator from New Hampshire if there were any necessity for them, or if the language applied to anything else.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. I wish to finish this reading.

Mr. Fortas continues:

And the same is true of public power developments. It is impossible to tell just exactly what this provision means with the words "or plants" and "or produced." But I think it is clear that it will mean litigation and indirectly increased expenses where funds are appropriated under this bill where a municipality wants to build a water system or wants to improve its water system or build a power plant or improve its power plant.

I concede that it probably never will occur under this joint resolution that that provision will interfere with a water system, because there will not be any built in competition with a privately owned water system; but it will occur all over the United States if the municipalities are to put in publicly owned municipal power plants. If they want to do so, and vote for it, I do not see any reason why Congress should stand in their way.

Farther on in the same testimony, speaking of litigation, somebody asked Secretary Ickes whether or not he would have any objection if they did have litigation. Secretary Ickes said:

We have spent a lot of time in court since 1933—

When they first started out; and I want to tell you that the time spent in court, without any exception, has been when they wanted to build a municipal power plant.

Mr. HOLMAN. How did the words "or plants" get in there?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know. They cannot do any good. They said, in effect, "If you had good lawyers, it would not make any difference if you did have lawsuits." Secretary Ickes said:

But we have spent a lot of time in court since 1933.

He might have added:

We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal and court fees, even though we won the suits in the end.

Mr. President, that being true, since it is a matter only of delay—it is a matter taken up here at 1 o'clock in the morning, when we have once had a vote on it, and adopted this amendment—I move to lay the motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the Chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to lay on the table the motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I want to have it clearly understood what the issue here is. Apparently, the United States Senate tonight wants to go on record as favoring taking relief funds from the poor people of the country to use in building and expanding municipal plants in competition with private industry.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, they will do a great deal of good for the poor people if they do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend while the Chair makes an announcement? There is no question pending before the Senate at this time.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I thought there was a joint resolution pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the floor, and there is a joint resolution pending, and I have a right to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to speak on the joint resolution. The Chair meant to say that there was no amendment pending.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I did not intend to prolong this discussion; but since an effort has been made to shut me off, I may take my 15 minutes now. We have stayed here for some time, and we can stay for a while longer.

This issue is pretty clear. I want to point out what the United States Senate is doing tonight. The Members of this body whose hearts bleed for the poor people of the country are tonight voting to use relief money to build municipal power plants and expand municipal power plants, rather

than letting the relief money go to the poor people of the Nation. That is what it amounts to.

I realize that there are different philosophies in this country. The Senator from Nebraska is entitled to his opinion and his philosophy on the expansion of public power plants; but this is a question of the use of relief funds. I am very glad to see the issue made so clear; but I want to go on record as one Member of the United States Senate who is not in favor of using relief funds to build power plants in this country. I want to go on record further as being one Member of the United States Senate who is not in favor of building with public funds any type of plants, mills, or factories to compete with private industry.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator has not only gone on record as one Member of the Senate who is trying to save the Nation, but he has gone on record as the one Member outstanding in the Senate of the United States who does just exactly what the Power Trust of America wants done.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to be recognized. I simply want to make the point of order that the Senator from New Hampshire has exhausted his time on the joint resolution and on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending, and the Senator from New Hampshire has spoken on the joint resolution. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY. I call for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HARRISON. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and withhold my vote.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. My colleague the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is unavoidably detained on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MEAD. My colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. My colleague [Mr. LOGAN] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily detained. I am advised that all of these Senators I have named, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to make some announcements for Senators who are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If present, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea." I am not advised how the Senator from Virginia would vote.

I announce a pair between the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I am not advised how those Senators would vote if present.

I announce that my colleague [Mr. GIBSON] would vote "yea" if present.

I announce a general pair between the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I am not advised how those Senators would vote if present.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—55

Adams	Frazier	Lee	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gerry	Lodge	Reed
Austin	Green	Lucas	Reynolds
Bankhead	Guffey	McCarran	Russell
Barkley	Gurney	McKellar	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Harrison	Maloney	Slattery
Bone	Hatch	Mead	Smathers
Bulow	Hayden	Miller	Stewart
Burke	Herring	Minton	Tobey
Capper	Hill	Murray	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Neely	Walsh
Connally	Hughes	Norris	Wheeler
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Ellender	La Follette	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—41

Ashurst	Danaher	Logan	Thomas, Okla.
Bailey	Donahey	Lundeen	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Downey	McNary	Townsend
Borah	George	Nye	Tydings
Bridges	Gibson	Overton	Vandenberg
Brown	Gillette	Pittman	Van Nuys
Byrd	Glass	Schwartz	Wagner
Byrnes	Hale	Sheppard	White
Caraway	Holt	Shipstead	
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Smith	
Clark, Idaho	King	Taft	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940."

Mr. HOLT subsequently said on Thursday morning, June 29, 1939,

Mr. President, I desire the RECORD to show that last night I was advised that there would be no yea-and-nay vote on the relief joint resolution. I left the floor, and before I could return the vote had been taken. Had I been present, I should have voted for the relief joint resolution.

If there is no objection, I desire to have this statement inserted in the permanent RECORD at a point following the roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be authorized to correct the totals in the joint resolution in accordance with the text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN,

Mr. BYRNES, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TOWNSEND conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

I understood, as I listened to the last remark of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], that he impugned the motives of the Senator from New Hampshire. As I understand, that is against the rules of the United States Senate. A man as old in the service of the Senate as is the Senator from Nebraska should know better than to make such a remark.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, what remark? I did not hear all that the Senator said. What remark does he refer to?

Mr. BRIDGES. I refer to the last remark the Senator made about the Power Trust.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; let the RECORD show what I said. I shall be glad to stand by it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Senator from Nebraska will appear in the RECORD, and the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire will also appear in the RECORD.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6977) to extend the time within which annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States may be commenced, for the year commencing at 12 o'clock m., July 1, 1938, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 698) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably the nomination of John M. Carmody, of New York, to be Federal Works Administrator, to be effective July 1, 1939.

He also, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following nominations:

Paul H. Alling, of Connecticut, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service; and

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a counselor of Embassy at Lima, Peru, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iran.

Mr. PITTMAN also, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported without reservation Executive N, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom for the exchange of certain stocks of cotton and rubber, signed at London on June 23, 1939, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 9) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. REYNOLDS (for Mr. LUNDEEN) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with the provisions of rule 40 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing of my intention hereafter to move to suspend paragraphs 1 and 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of proposing, for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], to the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz: At the end of the bill to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. —. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the boards of county commissioners of the

counties of Hennepin and Anoka in the State of Minnesota, in such proportions as the Secretary may deem appropriate, the sum of \$100,000, to be used for the relief of the victims of the tornado which occurred in such counties on June 18, 1939.

"SEC. —. Any sum paid to a board of county commissioners under the provisions of the first section of this act shall be apportioned by such board, in such proportions as it deems appropriate, to the villages and cities within such county which were affected by such tornado. Any sum so apportioned to a village or city shall be expended, under the joint direction of such board and of the municipal government of the village or city to which apportioned, for the relief of the victims of such tornado residing within, or in the neighborhood of, such village or city."

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with the provisions of rule 40 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing of my intention hereafter to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz: At the proper place in the bill to insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. That section 6 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940 (Public, No. 65, 76th Cong.), approved May 6, 1939, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. On and after July 1, 1939, no executive department or independent establishment of the Government shall transmit through the mail, free of postage, any book, report, periodical, bulletin, pamphlet, list, or other article or document (except official letter correspondence, including such enclosures as are reasonably related to the subject matter of the correspondence; informational releases in connection with the decennial census of the United States, mail concerning the sale of Government securities, and all forms and blanks and copies of statutes, rules, regulations, and instructions and administrative orders and interpretations necessary in the administration of such departments and establishments), unless a request therefor has been previously received by such department or independent establishment; or such transmission is required by law; or such document is transmitted to inform the recipient thereof of the adoption, amendment, or interpretation of a statute, rule, regulation, or order to which he is subject. For each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1939, the head of each independent establishment and executive department (other than the Post Office Department) shall submit to the Postmaster General, within 30 days after the close of the quarter, a statement of the weight of the mail matter by classes of mail that the independent establishment or department has transmitted free of postage during such quarter, and he shall also certify to the Postmaster General at the end of each such quarter that nothing was transmitted through the mail free of postage by the independent establishment or department in violation of the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the mailing free of postage of lists of agricultural bulletins, lists of public documents which are offered for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, or of announcements of publications of maps, atlases, statistical, and other reports offered for sale by the Federal Power Commission as authorized by section 312 of the Federal Power Act: *Provided further*, That this prohibition shall not apply to the transmission of such books, reports, periodicals, bulletins, pamphlets, lists, articles, or documents to educational institutions or public libraries, or to Federal, State, or other public authorities."

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6970, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to see the foregoing notice.)

THE MEANING OF CIVIL LIBERTY—ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL MURPHY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on June 21, 1939, by Hon. Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, at the commencement exercises of John Marshall College, Jersey City, N. J., on the subject *The Meaning of Civil Liberty*, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes a. m., Thursday, June 29), the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian.